THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXVI FEBRUARY, 1938 No. 212

EDITORIAL

It is a pity to harp always on one string. At times there is no help for it, as when Hope, in the allegory by G. F. Watts, has only one string left. Sometimes it is due to poverty of artistic equipment in the harper. He has only learned music as far as B flat, so to speak. But sometimes there is a reason for returning—not indeed always, but again—to the same theme, because there is reason for believing that it has not yet yielded up all the melody it has in charge. The particular motive for returning to the subject of Anglicanism is that the editor is writing in New York. He is sitting (Cicero, more politely, would have saved his readers trouble by using a past tense, *sedebat*, but our custom is to make readers do the mental gymnastic for themselves)—he is sitting in the Guest-Room (that is, a little suite consisting of a sitting-room, bedroom, and bathroom) of the Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church. He has during the past four days visited three Seminaries or Theological Colleges of the Methodist, the Presbyterian, and the Congregationalist Churches. In all he was welcomed with that courtesy which seems to be the unfailing attitude of the American to the visitor. But he was conscious not only of being of another country, but of another ecclesiastical tradition. In this Church College, where a first-class theological training is given for three years (three years, mark you !) to students who have already graduated at a University, it is very different. The members of the Faculty—that is, the Professors and Tutors—have often visited England and seem to know all about England, and especially the Church of England. And even if this were not so, it is a Sister Church. The English Churchman visiting America, and finding himself among Episcopalians, is no stranger and foreigner, but a fellow-citizen with the saints, and of the household of God.

This calls attention to the fact that the Anglican Communion is not racial only. In England, just as the climate of our island location (see how terminology is picked up) has helped to mould the national character, so the events of our island history have played their part in helping to form the *ethos* of the English Church. It is not for nothing that we are fellow-countrymen of King Alfred, Simon de Montfort, Henry VIII., Sir Thomas More, and Dr. Johnson. But that Anglicanism is more than this is proved by its existence in the missionary dioceses, in the Dominions and in the American Republic. Among a group of Episcopalians encountered a day or two ago in a city of Ohio were persons of German and Scandinavian name and origin. The fact is, Anglicanism is a way of understanding Christianity, a way of attempting to combine old and new, orthodoxy and freedom, a way of being Catholic, Evangelical and Liberal all at the same time. This makes it independent of race limits. It can exist and flourish anywhere. Lambeth Palace and Westminster Abbey are in London, on either side of Father Thames, and are likely to remain there, but the spirit which broods over those ancient places has long since taken the wings of the morning and has come to abide in the uttermost parts both of the sea and of the land. To find that something which he greatly values has taken root elsewhere and is bearing notable fruit makes a man say, not, indeed, in this instance, "Everything that I believe is true." He has not had time to verify everything, and the thing in question is not everything. But it is much, and it does make him say, "A significant, momentous thing, which I believed, is true."

Among the letters received by the editor during the last two or three months is one from a priest in Scotland. The writer says: "After twenty-five years of work in Scotland, I am more convinced than ever that the Catholic position of the Anglican Communion has a very great appeal to thoughtful members of both the Papal and the Presbyterian communities. I believe that, one day, we shall find ourselves, as the good ship *Dimbula* did in Kipling's story. Just at present the component parts are chattering loudly. I am so thankful that you end on the note, 'None should be for party, and all should be for Church.'" Another letter is from a layman, but a layman to whom Latin (we speak linguistically, not ecclesiastically) is familiar. He quotes Canons in that tongue. The layman, he says, is surely as much bound as the cleric to the liturgy, under pain of excommunication, to be absolved by the

Archbishop, and only then after public penance. "What, then, is the layman to think when he sees Bishop, Priest, and Deacon playing ducks and drakes with the liturgy? He is told, perhaps, that the Book of 1662 is too long, does not agree with primitive models, is too unlike its Latin ancestor, keeps people away from church . . . Dom Cabrol admits that he does not like the position of the Gloria in the modern Roman rite. I do not think he carries a Prayer Book to the altar and follows the use found there! Obedience is better than sacrifice. How dear in the sight of God must be that obedience that is joined with sacrifice, the sacrifice of personal likes and dislikes, of one's own idea of what a liturgy should be. Surely such loving sacrifice will have its reward in a liturgy more near that liturgy which, please God, we may hear celebrated in heaven."

At the same time another letter was received from a priest who mentions the practice, "very widely adopted," of using the Prayer of Oblation after the Prayer of Consecration, and putting the "Our Father" in its right place, sometimes with permission, sometimes, as he fears, without permission. This, of course, finds a place in the 1928 Book, but many Bishops forbid the emendation, if the 1662 is used. Certain priests use the emendation while clinging to the 1662 rite because (as our correspondent says) "they do not wish to separate themselves from the Church of England," and also (as he does not say) because they do not like the 1928 Book. Why do they act so? Our correspondent's answer is that liturgical knowledge has been for long part of their education. The 1662 rite is liturgically very unsatisfactory. The emendation is slight, and when explained can offend no reasonable mind. We shall never get one use in the Church of England till liturgical knowledge finds due and proper expression. There are very many loyal priests who have adopted this emendation as a tiny correction of a muddle which worries them. That, and no more. The only way of stopping that is to forbid the study of liturgies. Unity of Rite! *Voilà!* But at what a cost!

Thus far our correspondent. The natural answer to his very natural and laudable desire to restore the broken Canon is, Why not use the 1928 Book? Supposing that to be disliked, either on the ground that it follows the Scottish and American precedent in the placing of the *epiklesis*, or on some

other ground, what remains? The Bishop of Chichester returns the only answer that has any constitutional Anglican authority—1662. That is to say, you cannot justifiably use the Canon which you prefer, which is liturgically better, which the Bishop of Chichester would not think of blaming you for preferring. There is in the Church of England no authority for doing so. It is hard to see on any Catholic principle what authority any individual Bishop can have for sanctioning or any individual priest can have for using a rite, however good, which is not that of his Church. Yet the *non possumus* of the Bishop of Chichester does not look as if it could last very long. The priests who desire a full Canon are so numerous, so good, and indeed so right in what they desire that one of two things must happen soon. Either, as we hope, they will perceive the virtues of the 1928 rite, or the Church of England, having digested the report of the Doctrinal Commission, will officially do something to meet their needs, say a rite of 1948. Meantime, some of us are hopeful that the adoption of the proposed Synodical Declaration will help us. For the moment, even when sympathy and the good will that proceeds from liturgical knowledge have done their utmost, there are still only two alternatives, 1662 and 1928. Are we blaming the priests who find a third, fourth, fifth further dimension in which to expatiate? It is neither our duty nor our inclination to be their judge, and we accuse no one. But we have not found it possible to understand the principles on which they act.

The Introduction to the long-expected Report of the Doctrinal Commission says very wisely that "there is not, and the majority of us do not desire that there should be, a system of distinctively Anglican theology." This will reassure such as are fearful lest the Church in the provinces that are in communion with Canterbury should begin (or continue) to exhibit "a schismatic temper." Later (on p. 110) the Report says:

> "The appeal to the Catholic Church or to Catholic tradition appears to us to involve in modern circumstances a refusal to become wholly immersed in the tradition of any one Christian communion, and a determination to recognize the experience and teaching of Christendom as a whole as possessing more fully than any partial system the authority of the Catholic Church. It is the mark of a sectarian mind to refuse to acknowledge what is of permanent truth and value in the tradition of other communions; the "Catholic" should never be "sectarian," however large the "sect" to which he belongs.

At the same time we have a tradition, and it is, moreover, the fact that the Commission was appointed not to prepare a

Summa, but to assist Churchmen of this generation. This explains the form of the document. It is *ad hoc*. It is Galatians rather than Romans, Colossians rather than Ephesians. It is in no wise intended to be a complete treatment of Christian doctrine. It is an attempt to reach the utmost degree of unity which could be attained by a number of theologians of very different kinds in the treatment of those doctrines about which there is among us uncertainty and controversy. This purpose it admirably fulfils. It does not, except incidentally, tell us what to make of Whitehead or Loisy or Couchoud or Aldous Huxley. It is concerned with the nature of Christian orthodoxy in the twentieth century, and with such matters as the doctrine of the Real Presence, and the place that will be occupied by episcopacy in the Church of the future.

The Commission does not regard itself as having any judicial function. It is, for example, content to say (p. 183) that its members are—

> " agreed that the use of the reserved sacrament is a ' valid ' means of giving sacramental communion; they are agreed also that the extent to which and the circumstances in which this method should be employed may properly be determined by any particular Church. The decision on these questions involves, however, a variety of practical considerations . . . and we hold it to be outside the province of the Commission, here as elsewhere, to express an opinion on administrative or pastoral questions.
>
> " The same is true, as it appears to us, in regard to devotions connected with the reserved sacrament. The question of whether they ought to be allowed by any particular Church in the Anglican Communion, or whether the rules and formularies of the Church of England ought to be changed so as to countenance such devotions, is again a question involving considerations with some of which we are not concerned."

The purpose of the Report is thus mainly to give such theological counsel as competent theologians can give on certain difficult and debatable questions. Nevertheless, it does also contain a great deal of very sound theological teaching of a general kind, especially in the sections on " God and the World," " The Doctrine of Sin," and " The Resurrection." There are points at which it is admitted that some members of the Commission would have put the matter more strongly, and there are points at which an important divergence of conviction is indicated—*e.g.*, on miracle and on the necessity of belief in the Virgin Birth. On the whole there is a very reassuring degree of unanimity, and a resolute determination to interpret the Revelation of God which has been given to the world in Christ according to the learned, truth-loving, orthodox tradition

which is our fortunate inheritance. There are concessions which will alarm the timid, and perhaps also those who think of the Catholic Faith as a quantity. But the doctrinal strength of the Report will surprise two classes of persons, if it should be read by them. It will surprise those who think that we are occupied—

"En abandonnant un dogme après l'autre—c'est ce qu'ils appellent une 'refonte' (restatement). Mais cet euphémisme couvre mal une défaite—ils ont accrédité l'opinion que la vérité est relative et qu'il suffit à une religion de satisfaire un individu, pour être vrai pour lui, tout en contradisant formellement d'autres religions, vraies elles aussi pour d'autres hommes.*

And it will surprise the High Command of the enemy, who affect to believe that we are only an obsolescent branch of the Primrose League. All Churchmen, and many others, too, should be grateful to the Chairman of the Commission and his colleagues for the happy result of what must have been very arduous labours.

* *La Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, July, 1931.

PAUL ELMER MORE AS THEOLOGIAN

"If there be any true myth, if the divine nature has at any time in any wise directly revealed itself to man, if any voice shall ever reach us out of the infinite circle of silence, where else shall we look but to the words of the Gospel? Not Christianity alone is at stake in our acceptance or rejection of the Incarnation, but religion itself."

In these words, found in *The Christ of the New Testament*,* we have the considered opinion of Paul Elmer More on the significance of the faith that in Jesus Christ the Eternal Word of God was made flesh and dwelt among us. To have this said by a man of More's eminence, scholarship, and profound understanding is surely no mean matter. And because it was said by him, and mightily defended in many essays and books, the *intelligentsia* of our day have been forced, almost against their will, to consider that Christianity still has something to say for itself, and perhaps something to say directly and clearly to them.

For Mr. More was known throughout the world of letters as one of its most distinguished leaders. Widely read in all literatures, acquainted with many languages both eastern and western, interested in philosophical as well as in purely literary problems, the possessor of a style which few of our day can equal, with friends in every part of the globe, this "Princeton hermit," as he was sometimes called, had made a long and painful pilgrimage from a blank agnosticism with an ethical tinge to the Catholic faith in the Incarnate Lord. It was a pilgrimage taken along his own path, but in the end it led him to acknowledge Jesus Christ as "Lord and God." And it brought him to the place where he was a loyal attendant on the services of the Anglican Communion, willing to be known as a Catholic of the Anglican persuasion, even though he was never confirmed, and devoutly convinced that in the Eucharist the Word of God who was incarnate in Christ is "really present in the bread and wine, making of them (His) own body, and by their material instrumentality imparting (Himself) to the embodied souls of men."†

Along these lines his influence has been immeasurable. To his home in Princeton came scores of young men, students and friends, who learned from him to regard Christianity as very

* P. 293.

† *The Catholic Faith*, p. 167.

much a " live option " in the world today. From his writings many were brought to a new consideration of the significance of the Catholic faith in a world torn by cross-currents of thought. And as he grew older this was his deepest happiness, as those who knew him well can testify.

In the present essay we shall consider Mr. More's views on various important articles of the Christian faith. For this purpose our chief sources will be his books, *The Catholic Faith* and *The Sceptical Approach to Religion*, in which he set forth his thought most clearly and succinctly. Time and again we shall necessarily be critical, for it can hardly be denied that More's ideas were distinctly his own, and in certain particulars cannot be called satisfactory or adequate. But with these criticisms in mind we must also remember that in spirit and intention he was both Catholic and Christian, and loyally Anglican, as he understood those terms. And our spirit must be humble, for More was a great thinker, and it requires both courage *and* humility to differ from him.

The first point to which our attention may be turned is the question of " religious knowledge." How do we come to the knowledge of God, to the faith in His existence and character, and to the " experience " of His reality and presence ? There is no doubt at all of Mr. More's position here. He has expressed it plainly enough in the early essays of *The Sceptical Approach.* A few quotations will indicate his approach.

Faith is defined as " the faculty that urges us on to carry over the immediate sense of personal freedom and responsibility and purpose into our interpretation of the world at large, in defiance, if need be, of that more self-assertive display of reason which we call rationalism. To faith the whole world thus becomes teleological; and religion is an attempt to live in harmony with a world so conceived." " Now if cosmic teleology is an inference from the teleological knowledge of myself [as possessed of purpose, responsibility and freedom], if faith is a transference of this triple form of consciousness to a Being who transcends the world, then we are bound by our faith to a corresponding conception of the nature and operation of such a Being." " One may say that the change from superstition to religion and the gradual development of religion to the most refined theism can be measured by an ever-clearer understanding of personality as involved in the intuition of purpose and freedom and responsibility, by an ever-clearer conception of faith as a conscious inference of such a personality behind the mechanism of observed phenomena." " So long as God remains a purposeful Being—and to faith He can be only that—He must be imagined as working out a design, just

as man is conscious of doing, through some sort of obstacle or hindrance and by the lingering processes of time."*

Perhaps these sentences will have indicated the way in which More approached the question of religious knowledge. Our understanding of God, for him, is reached primarily by way of faith; and faith is an inference from our own consciousness of purpose, freedom, and responsibility as part of our nature as moral beings. Recognizing these within us, we are led to infer that they are in the world outside, and to live (dare we put it this way, remembering certain philosophies of the recent past?) "as if" they really were existent. The universe appears chaotic, meaningless, without purpose, at a first glance. But by reading our own sense of moral reality into it we find that it makes sense, and that a life on that basis is justified by its fruits.

Now it is obvious that there is much truth in this analysis of the logic of religious knowledge. And it should be borne in mind that Mr. More does not completely exclude other ways of approach to God. His admission made at the very beginning of *The Sceptical Approach* is witness to this. But, on the other hand, his criticism of Baron von Hügel's religious epistemology, both in *The Sceptical Approach*† and in the more recent collected book of essays, *On Human Nature*, shews plainly enough that Mr. More did not feel strongly the more realistic view of von Hügel and those who think with him.

An obvious criticism of More's position is that it offers no sound reply to the materialist or secularist, who would say: "Well, all you are doing is making a guess from your own experience. I can make another guess, with equal reason, and you have nothing to say against me." The justice of the criticism is frankly admitted by Mr. More; but he points out in this connection that at least one may say that all the higher, nobler, finer instincts of man call out for his choice, for the inference of purpose and freedom, for the being of a conscious God like unto man's moral consciousness. True enough, but then what if one does not care?

Is it not sounder to base the knowledge which we have of God on a view of the world which sees man as set in a great system of events, things, experiences, constantly pouring in upon him, making their demands upon him, calling forth from him certain characteristic responses, and in their highest aspect demanding from him that activity which we call religion? Is it not more in keeping with the very genius of religion to hold that faith is man's "amen," his responsive activity, to the ceaselessly insistent pressure of reality, and in

* Pp. 1-26 *passim.* † P. 3.

the end of Reality itself (the ultimate environment, God) upon him and through him ? Such a view has been worked out by von Hügel, and sketched too in the recent Gifford Lectures of the Archbishop of York.* To the writer, at any rate, it appears that faith is much more a response than an inference, although it may be wiser to say that it is a response involving an inference—that is, a living awareness of the whole personality in which the rather more intellectual matter of an inference as to the specific nature of the Reality, outside and operative through man, has its legitimate (but not exclusive) place.

Yet there is something very fine indeed about More's position. For it does this one thing, at least: it makes quite clear the fact that the venture of religion is no easy thing, that it demands all there is in a man (recalling Huxley's famous statement, " It doesn't take much of a man to be a Christian, but it takes all of him "), and that it is a noble and high calling which man at his best answers gladly and courageously. Further, it is well to have brought before us once more the important fact that religion is, so to say, self-verifying; that it is as men do the will that they learn more deeply, and become more convinced of the truth of the teaching. For all this we may be grateful.

Another point for consideration is the nature of the God who is reached through religion. Taking the analogy of human moral life—and, as we have hinted, taking it too exclusively—Mr. More comes to belief in a Being who is in some sense limited. One of our quotations above shewed this, and there are many others which might be cited. God is working with some intractable necessity, perhaps some downward drag in things, even some pre-existent material; He is more like an artificer than a creator, more like a designer than one who out of His very self brings forth that which is other than Himself.† To some degree it is the problem of evil which brings More to this conclusion. In conversation he would often refer to certain occurrences in the animal or human world, to natural catastrophe or physical disaster, and would question how a perfectly good Being who was also all-powerful could be responsible for these.

Here is indeed a major problem. To discuss it adequately would require a book by itself. Nevertheless, it is certain that the main stream of Christian tradition has always asserted that the Divine Reality is the union of absolute power and perfect goodness. How these are to be reconciled we may not be able to see; but that they can be reconciled, and that in the innermost

* *Nature, Man and God.* For von Hügel especially *The Reality of God.*

† *The Sceptical Approach*, p. 25

secret of the being of God they are one, is (we venture to think) of the essence of the Catholic doctrine of the Godhead. Surely it is better to hold to both sides of this tension, and to hope for more light on the problem, than to give up either side, and to have a terrible and loveless power at the heart of things, or (as Mr. More would seem to suggest*) a "finite God," even though we refuse to declare Him to be such.

It is against such a background that we come to More's doctrine of Christ. Holding firmly to man as an amphibian being, between animality and the pure spiritual reality of God, knowing both realms and sharing in both, and yet possessed of a moral nature which raises him far above the beasts and makes him only a little lower than the angels, Mr. More sought for a guarantee of his faith in purposiveness, freedom, and responsibility. He found it in Christ, interpreted as the Word made flesh. Preparation for this was to be seen in the Hebrew religion especially; but the point where divine and human meet is in Christ. "Considering the objective means whereby God makes known His nature and will, I for one simply cannot conceive a further step in the scale of revelation beyond the historic event of the Word made flesh. If our knowledge of God is a developing assurance that the inference from intuition is true, and that the world is not wholly, as it appears to observation, a huge unmeaning fatality, but at once conceals and reveals a Power corresponding to our own purposive conscience, then I cannot imagine a further step in the hierarchical conjunction of spirit and matter than the condescending act of the Creator in entering personally into His creation and in being born as man among men."†

That is finely said. Yet one may be permitted to wonder whether Mr. More ever quite realized the *implications* of the faith of the Incarnation. And one may ask how revelation has so suddenly come to the front, if almost up until this time it has been entirely a matter of intuition, inference; indeed, projection from our inner life upon the world. Is Christ the only, the unrelated, act of God in this direct manner in our world? Sometimes it would appear so; and the careful analysis of the grades of "revelation" and human apprehension thereof, in the chapter from which we have just quoted,‡ does not entirely remove our suspicion on this head. There seems little sense of Christ as one who (in a fine phrase of Bishop Chandler's) "is harmonious with and expressive of" the whole nature and context of the Reality from which He appears. Yet is it not true that such a sense is bound up with the faith in

* Especially in *The Sceptical Approach*, Chapter IV.
† *The Sceptical Approach*, pp. 159 *ff.* ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 167.

Christ as the specially Incarnate One, and is the generous guarantee of the divine loving-kindness and mercy through the whole process of revelation, both Jewish and "pagan," and (as we would venture to add) both religious and secular?

This is a vast problem. The writer has discussed it at length in an article published several years ago.* And perhaps it might be interesting to bring in here a somewhat personal note, for which we ask permission and pardon. One day Mr. More telephoned the writer and asked him to visit him that afternoon—one of many visits which are to be remembered with gratitude and joy. The purpose of the request was soon revealed. Mr. More had a letter from a friend who had written a long and detailed criticism (along these lines) of his Christological views, and had suggested a constructive statement in opposition to Mr. More's. "Are those views really held by many younger Anglican Catholics?" asked Mr. More. He was told that this was true; and he then asked for some more complete statement. The writer prepared one, later published in England. To it Mr. More answered with a very thorough criticism which forms part of *The Sceptical Approach*,† and was also published in THEOLOGY. But the interesting point is that More was so convinced of the error of the view suggested that even when the reply by the writer appeared in the same journal a few months later he never referred to it, and he never told the friend who had first written the criticism of his Christology that he had found confirmation of that criticism by others.

This little story has been told with a purpose. For it seems to indicate that Mr. More had a fear on the matter: he had won his way to the faith in the Incarnation, but he was afraid that by extending the meaning of that faith along the lines of much of our best contemporary theology (as in von Hügel, Temple, Dr. Cross, and Canon Raven) he might lose the clear, sharp position which he had attained. And it also appears that this fear is witnessed by the very attitude towards faith and religious knowledge which we have already noticed: he would not set these in the context of a larger experience, and he would not admit that through the whole range of life, at every level and through every type of experience, God is making Himself known to men, and in Christ makes Himself known, and His presence and activity realized, in that very context and in a supreme, sufficient and definitive manner.

It is worth noting that More recognized the important fact that belief in the mode of Christ's birth and the actual nature of the Resurrection were secondary to the faith in the Incarnation

* THEOLOGY, September, 1934.

† Much of Chapter VII.

and the continued presence and power of our Lord. This is said plainly in his chapter on the Creeds in *The Catholic Faith*;* and here he is in sympathy with the views of Professor A. E. Taylor in *The Faith of a Moralist*.† Many will not agree with this position; but the writer is convinced of its truth and (what is more) of its value in our own age. The Virgin Birth and the (so-called) physical Resurrection are distinct from, although they may very well be congruous with, the Incarnation and Resurrection doctrines of the Church; and we shall do well to bear this in mind. Mr. More is very clear on the point; and his insistence is all the more valuable when one remembers that his idea of the Incarnation was much more rigid than that of many who are perhaps more certainly to be classed as Catholic theologians.

We have time to speak of but three additional points, and they must be mentioned only in passing. More was vague about the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, inclining towards an impersonal notion of the Spirit and hence to a binitarian view of the Godhead. For him the one essential doctrine of the Catholic faith was the Incarnation, as he asserted over and over again;‡ and the fully developed Trinitarian formularies were in some senses the result of the overweening pride of the human mind, with its desire to comprehend and tabulate the being of God. He brought to bear on this matter of the Holy Spirit the wealth of his learning in Patristics; yet we may venture to think that he fell here into a kind of literalism all of his own. Surely the doctrine of the Trinity, understood (in C. C. J. Webb's phrase) as "a hint thrown out at a great mystery," with its teaching that in God all that is valuable of social life as well as all that is significant in strictly personal life has its ground and guarantee, is not in any way incongruous with his own developed theology: on the contrary, it is the fitting corner-stone for his views.

More was a convinced believer in the Church as the fellowship of the faithful and the Body of Christ. His essay§ on this subject, dealing especially with "authority but not infallibility," is (some of us think) his finest piece of theological writing. And he was a firm defender of the Anglican Communion and its *via media* between Roman intransigeance and Protestant subjectivism.‖ As to the sacraments, his position once more was sound and was argued with great learning and fervour. The Eucharist was to him the supreme Christian act of worship,

* Pp. 76 *ff*. † Chapter III.
‡ *The Catholic Faith*, p. 77, and many other places in his works.
§ *Ibid.*, Chapter IV.
‖ Introductory essay in *Anglicanism*, edited by P. E. More and F. L. Cross.

central and indispensable, since it is inextricably linked with the Incarnation itself. And he maintained that "upon the preservation [of the Eucharist] as the central act of worship it becomes clearer with the passing years that the continuity of the Church will depend."*

This essay has been very largely critical. But we cannot close without recalling once more the deep spirituality, profound faith, and humble life of its subject. More was a great man, a very great man; he was also a genuine Christian, and in the end a simple believer in the Lord Jesus. To those of us who had the inestimable privilege of his friendship, counsel, and guidance he seems in retrospect to be one of those who being dead yet speaketh. We cannot close more appropriately than by citing his own words,† when in discussing the doctrine of the communion of saints he wrote: "The lesser dead as well as the greater are included among the saints, those of our own circle who have gone before, and who speak to us, not in the dull mechanical fashion of the spiritualists so-called, but in a silence that can stir our being to its depths. There are those who will tell you how sometimes at the hearing of the mass or at the regular morning and evening service of prayer, and more especially when the congregation is united in saying the Creed, they become strangely aware of the presence of one 'loved long since and lost awhile,' and with that spirit seem to be carried close to the throne of mercy. And the memory of that communion is to them inexpressibly sweet. You may say that they are carried away by æsthetic emotions, momentarily rapt out of themselves by the illusions of fancy. It may be so; but I believe that they are not utterly deceived."

W. Norman Pittenger.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH

Two sharply contrasted views have been taken with regard to the solution of the problem whether and how far Jesus was consciously at work moulding a society which should carry on His work after His own earthly ministry was over.

The traditional view is concisely and effectively presented by F. D. Maurice in *The Kingdom of Christ*, Part II., Chapter IV., Section V.: "If we call the Four Gospels 'The Institution of a Christian Ministry' we might not go very far wrong, or lose sight of their essential qualities."

* *The Catholic Faith*, p. 198. † *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.

The modern view is sufficiently indicated in an extract from an article by Dr. Inge, quoted by Dr. Anderson Scott in his paper, *What happened at Pentecost*:*

"The first disciples believed that they had their Master's authority for expecting the end of the existing world order in their own lifetime. Whether they understood Him or not, clearly they could not have held this opinion if they had received instructions for the constitution of a Church."

Dr. Anderson Scott's object in making this quotation is, indeed, simply to discredit the hypothesis, which has in the past been widely held among Anglicans, that our Lord's teaching concerning the Kingdom in "the great Forty Days" (Acts i. 3) consisted in instructions on the constitution and organization of the Church, including the institution of the threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. But it is important to remember that there is nothing in the faith of an approaching catastrophic end of the world in this generation inconsistent with the faith that the way to prepare for that catastrophe is to gather disciples out of the world, and to build them up into a society under regularly constituted officers. The only thing precluded by the narrowest eschatological outlook is any express provision made by our Lord and taught by Him to His disciples regulating the transmission of ministerial authority to later generations.

No one, of course, doubts that the Christian Church in some sense owes its origin to our Lord. It is the direct result of His presence and work in the world; it is built on faith in Him. The question refers only to the nature of the relation between His coming in the flesh and the origin of the Church.

There are, I think, three possible directions in which we can look for a solution of this problem.

There is the theory of the Anglican tradition. According to this the constitution of the Church—*i.e.*, the outline of its organization with its threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, with their specific functions—was laid down by our Lord Himself, partly in the teaching recorded in the Gospels, but mainly in the teaching assumed to have been given in "the great Forty Days" between the Resurrection and the Ascension, when, as St. Luke tells us, He was specially occupied with teaching concerning the Kingdom of God.

This theory is too mechanical. It treats the Church too much as an organization, too little as an organism. It is worth notice that the volume of essays on the Church and the ministry, edited by Dr. Swete, contained no allusion to "the great Forty Days."

* See *The Spirit*, p. 135.

The Gospel criticism of the early part of this century in what is known as its "eschatological" form stands in startling contrast to the traditional view. To a strict eschatologist not only is there no evidence that Jesus laid down any lines to regulate the organization of a Church, which was to last through the ages: it was impossible for Him to do so, because He anticipated, and taught His disciples to anticipate, a catastrophic appearance of the Kingdom of God in their lifetime, which would bring the world to an abrupt end. Their one business was to testify to Him and to His approaching return. And for that purpose no special organization was required, still less any provision for its perpetuation. This is substantially the view of Dr. Inge, though it is only fair to say that he is by no means a thorough-going eschatologist.

We must not turn aside now to examine the various questions raised by the eschatologists. The important thing for the moment is to do justice to their criticism of the traditional theory of the origin of the Church. It is certainly bewildering, when we are asked to pass at once from a theory which makes the constitution of the Church as concrete a thing as the constitution of the United States of America to a theory which makes it the result of blind or, at least, unconscious evolutionary forces.

The appeal, of course, must lie in the first instance to the evidence supplied by the Evangelists. And the problem is complicated by the fact that the eschatologists have their own theory of the origin and relation of the Gospels. There is a strong tendency to treat the Gospel of St. Mark as the one primary authority, and to rule out as secondary and inconclusive any evidence which does not fit readily into the framework supplied by that Gospel. I think myself that this problem of the origin of the Church may have great value as a test question to try their theory of the historical value of the Gospels. Our immediate point, however, is this. The direct evidence of the first three Gospels (leaving St. John for the present out of consideration) to the fact that our Lord intended to found a Church is extraordinarily small. It is, in fact, limited to the one text, Matt. xvi. 18. And on that we cannot lay any stress at this stage for the reason already indicated. It is more than suspect because it is peculiar to St. Matthew in a context common to the three. And the whole question at issue is whether such a passage embodies a genuine reminiscence of words actually spoken by our Lord, or whether it is the creation of a devout Christian imagination in the light of later events. Even the command to the disciples to admit others to discipleship by baptism is, we are reminded,

in like manner limited in the true text (for Mark xvi. 16 is no part of the original Gospel) to Matt. xxviii. 19. We are bound to admit that we also look in vain for such evidence of design as we should expect to find in the work of the founder of a state or an order, in the shape of a code of laws and a formulated constitution. Jesus left nothing in writing. His teaching of His disciples (though no doubt, as F. D. Maurice claims, it followed a true method of its own) was the reverse of systematic. We are driven, therefore, to the conclusion that the influence of His personality and the memory of His life and teaching were, in fact, a living germ, and out of that germ the Christian Church evolved through the ages in circumstances which, the eschatologist contends, must have been extraordinarily different from any that could have been consciously present to the mind of the Master.

In other words, we are asked to believe that " He builded wiser than He knew," and to regard the Church as the result (to use a figure of James Hinton's) of a blind, unconscious instinct—like that which guides a bird in building a nest, or of the " vital urge " of a biologist like Henri Bergson.

Now, we cannot but be grateful to this type of criticism for calling attention to the absence of any written code or stereotyped constitution for the Christian Church. I think we can see that, had such existed, it would have been a hindrance and not a help. It would have checked and not fostered the development of Church life, and have been inconsistent with its most striking characteristic. I mean its infinite adaptability in face of constant variations of outward circumstances and conditions, coupled with its loyal preservation of substantial identity of type. And the precise question that I wish to raise is this: Is it true to the evidence supplied by the Gospels to treat this result as the effect of blind—at best subconscious—instinct, or is it the result of the working of what we can only adequately describe as creative insight, using to the full the forces inherent in the vital urge, and making them consciously co-operant to a clearly realized end ?

Coming back, then, to the familiar Gospel story with this question in our minds, what do we find ? We find Jesus moving up and down Palestine preaching, as the Baptist had preached before Him, the Gospel of the Kingdom. But preaching it in a different way. The Baptist stood on the threshold and preached it from without. Jesus has stepped forward through the door opened by His Baptism, and preaches the Kingdom from within. He knows its secrets. He expounds its laws. He wields the powers characteristic of it—the powers of the

age to come—and He calls men to fit themselves for entrance into it by personal discipleship to Himself.

A word of caution is necessary here. The Church and the Kingdom are closely allied in thought. Many of the characteristics of the Kingdom can only be manifested in the world in and through the Church. The Church is the divinely appointed instrument for the spread of the Kingdom among men. But the two conceptions are distinct, and it is important to steer clear of the danger which lurks in our natural tendency to confound them. We must not, however, turn aside now to consider the doctrine of the Kingdom. We must keep our attention fixed on the little band of men and women whom He gathered round Him. F. D. Maurice calls our attention to the large proportion of His time which was devoted to the training and teaching of this little group, especially of the Twelve. They constituted the central core of it. And He chose them—as St. Mark tells us expressly (iii. 14 *f.*)—*that they might be with Him, and that He might send them forth* as His representatives to proclaim the Kingdom and to wield its powers in His Name. Whether we call this (with F. D. Maurice) "the institution of a Christian ministry" or not, there can be no doubt that the main result of the earthly ministry was the gathering round our Lord of a group of men and women who were united to Him "by a personal bond of faith and devotion, exercised in union and consequent brotherly love."

These two links—the link with the Lord and the link with fellow-believers—constitute, as Dr. Hort points out in his *Christian Ecclesia*, the two fundamental characteristics of the Church's life in all ages.

Jesus does not, in the first three Gospels, speak directly about this unity. He says little that can be supposed to bear on the organization of His disciples as a body. His one injunction to corporate action on the part of a local congregation (Matt. xviii. 17) suggests the carrying on of the synagogue organization into the new order, though it is transfigured by the promise of His own presence in the midst of every community that is gathered *into His Name*. But the unity is implied in occasional figures and phrases—*e.g.*, the household of servants with different tasks and talents under a common head, *the city set on a hill* and *the little flock*. Above all, in the Last Supper He left behind a permanent memorial, the very heart of which is "personal faith and devotion to Himself, exercised in union and consequent brotherly love."

Now this, neither more nor less, is I believe, the thought that inspires the familiar words with which, according to St.

Matthew, our Lord greeted Simon Peter's confession of faith in Him as *the Christ, the Son of the living God.* "Thou art Peter, and on thee, and such as thee, on the rock from which thou art hewn, I will build My New Israel, 'My ecclesia.'" The figure of building recurs in the mysterious promise, to which allusion is made in all the four Gospels, to rebuild the ruined temple in three days. And it underlies St. Paul's use of the same by no means obvious metaphor in Eph. ii. 20. And I must say that I find it easier to believe that this utterance, and all that it implies of conscious purpose in the founding of the Church, is a genuine historical reminiscence, rather than that it is the creation of a later Christian imagination, using a figure derived from St. Paul to give an unhistorical dignity to St. Peter.

When we pass on to the Fourth Gospel the public ministry is brought before us in substantially the same light. The appeal is still primarily to individuals. Only the personal claim is more explicit, and the unity of believers is expressly mentioned and contemplated as a goal (John x. 16). It was to be the result, we must notice, of activities which could not begin till after the Crucifixion. For it was to heal the breach in humanity caused by the fundamental division which, in the old world, divided the Gentile from the Jew. It was to be the fruit of death for the whole world, after which, and by means of which, the Good Shepherd would gather the scattered and divided sheep into the unity of a living organism—a *flock*; and not, as we have unfortunately been accustomed to think of it, a *fold*.

Further, the mysterious saying (ii. 19) with regard to the rebuilding of the ruined temple in three days is explained by the Evangelist as referring to *the temple of His Body.* St. John therefore saw in it a reference (1) to the relation of the disciples to their Lord as members of a living organism; and (2) to the function of that body as a shrine of God's presence on earth, taking the place of the material sanctuary, which the unfaithfulness of the Jews was dooming to extinction.

After the close of his account of the public ministry, St. John gives us a long discourse on the Upper Chamber and the high priestly prayer. These chapters (xiii.-xvii.) are clearly of the deepest significance for the solution of our problem.

The discourse takes the place of the eschatological discourse in the Synoptists (Matt. xxiv. 25; Mark xiii.; Luke xxi.). Its main purpose is to prepare the disciples for the new order which was to begin for them with the Resurrection and Ascension of their Lord. It reveals the truths in virtue of which the faithful are knit into His Body, and constitute the

new spiritual temple, the shrine of the divine presence in the world.

It begins (xiii.) with the feet washing, by which the leaven of ambition and self-seeking was finally cleansed out of the body of the disciples, both individually and corporately. It laid the foundation in them of a society that could be at unity in itself, because it cherished the ideal of humility and mutual service in place of the competitive ideal, which is dominant in ordinary human society.

Then comes the New Commandment as the hall-mark of the new discipleship, the witness to the world of the abiding presence in its midst of the Spirit of the Lord: love with a new measure and a new motive. This New Commandment is enforced first by the example already given of love in the days of the ministry (xiii. 34). It is repeated twice later (xv. 12, 17) in the light of the coming Passion, and of the new relationship to the Father implied in the promise of prevailing prayer, which would be introduced by the Resurrection.

The next three chapters (xiv.-xvi.) deal directly with the conditions of the new order. The guiding thoughts are three. He is going to the Father. He will send the Spirit. Though out of sight Himself, He will be in closer and more intimate touch with His disciples than had been possible in the days of His flesh. The chapters contain in consequence a revelation of the Trinity (supplying, we may note in passing, the necessary background for Matt. xxviii. 19). But the revelation is not formal or systematic. It is directed from point to point to meet the needs of disciples left without a visible head, face to face with a hostile world.

This teaching contemplates not, indeed, a final condition, the end of the world. For it is throughout looking forward to a yet more glorious day, when at last the whole world shall believe and be saved (xvii. 21); but to the beginning of a new order, the life of the age to come beyond the Judgment, in which the Church was in the near future to live and witness for her Lord. In the strictest sense the constitution of the Church is implied in it. But that constitution is defined not from without, but from within, by the response of its members to their true environment, now at last fully revealed in the new threefold Name of God; and by their relation to the hostile world, which they have to win for Christ, who has both judged and redeemed it.

There is nothing temporary or provisional in this constitution. It is carefully thought out, and definite; but it is not formal or mechanical. It contains no external rules of order or discipline. It is a seed with inexhaustible potentiality

of development, according to the norm supplied by its abiding environment. It is strictly eschatological. The Kingdom was indeed at hand, and they were to enter into it in their lifetime. But it was to be built on the ruins of a great spiritual—not of a great physical—catastrophe.

The root of the whole matter lies here (as it does in Matt. xvi. 18 and xxviii. 19) in faith in the Messiahship and divine Sonship of Jesus. The historical facts of His life on earth have an abiding significance for the Church in all ages. He whom His Apostles had known in the days of His flesh, and who was linked to them in consequence by a bond which death could consecrate, but could not destroy, was the Word of God, the embodiment of a complete revelation of the Godhead, which it was important that they should understand in all its fulness and variety.

The first element in this revelation is the revelation of the Father. The humanity with which they had been in contact was itself moulded throughout by its relation to the divine. Jesus had lived before the eyes of men in constant, unbroken communion with His God and their God, His Father and their Father. He had thereby interpreted to them in terms of flesh and blood the inmost thought, the heart and mind and will of their Father. His mission to the world is, in a sense, exhausted in this revelation. He has come in His Father's Name, to bear witness to Him, to glorify Him by bringing Him near to the hearts of men, who were perishing for lack of the knowledge of Him. Here, then, is the first stage in the revelation which determines the whole character of the Church, and is the very heart of the truth which the Church holds in trust for the world. Her gospel is first and foremost simply this: "The power at the back of the universe is love. God is like Jesus. He that hath seen Him hath seen the Father."

The fact of this revelation, so mediated, implies two further facts with regard to the nature, first of man, and then of the Godhead. The first is this. If a perfect revelation of God is possible in the terms of humanity, human nature must from the beginning have been created *in the image of God*. Jesus is a revelation not of God only, but of the true essential being of man as well, the image after which we were created. Appearing as man among men, Jesus had inherited the title foretold for Him by prophet and psalmist, the title *Son of God*. And He had lived before men the life of perfect communion, which expresses the ideal of the relationship foreshadowed, however imperfectly, in the relation between a human father and his son.

This is a tremendous claim to make on behalf of flesh and blood. Its only justification would seem to lie in the fact that the communion so manifested has its ground in an inner distinction as of a Father and a Son within the Godhead itself, prior to all manifestation. Jesus was not only the Son of God, but the revelation in human form (because of the fundamental correspondence, if not identity, of nature between the human and the divine) of God the Son.

Even this is not all. The manifestation of the Son to the world was accompanied by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit of God on His humanity. If human nature is to attain its goal as the mirror for the revelation of the divine, it needs not only an original constitution in the form of God, which is to be the law of its development, but a power from within to respond to that law. This inmost secret of life from within, the quickening power of response to the new environment, the new order, the Kingdom of Heaven, into which the human consciousness of Jesus was raised at His Baptism, is revealed in the third element in the divine Unity. So the promise of the Spirit of the Truth, the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, is given in these chapters to assure us that, as we ascend with Christ into the new order, the same quickening power which dwelt in Him shall take possession of us, and enable us to develop true to our norm—the name once for all revealed in human flesh in the life and death, the resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ.

This revelation and these promises are, however, given not to individuals as such, but to members of a Body, as the token and condition of their membership, to qualify them for a work which can only be discharged by the Body as a whole. For the burthen of standing before men in Christ's name would overwhelm any man in isolation from his fellows; and yet the specific task of each individual is, in the nature of the case, distinctive, and so far isolating, even divisive. We see, therefore, from a new side the importance of the New Commandment. We understand the intensity of the Lord's longing that His disciples should be one, that found reiterated expression in His great high priestly prayer: *Holy Father, keep them in Thy Name, which Thou hast given Me, that they may be one, as we are* (John xvii. 11).

Neither for these only do I pray, but for those that believe on Me through their word; that they may all be one, even as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be in us; that the world may know that Thou didst send Me. And the glory which Thou hast given Me I have given them, that they may be one as we are one: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be

perfected into one, that the world may know that Thou didst send Me, and lovedst them even as Thou lovedst Me (John xvii. 20-23).

Such in outline is the teaching of these wonderful chapters. It is throughout, we must notice, in the closest harmony with the fundamental principles of the constitution of the Church, as our study of the first three Gospels brought them before us—viz., "Personal faith and devotion to Jesus confessed as the Christ, the Son of the living God, exercised in union and consequent brotherly love." But that simple theme is developed and expanded until it includes a revelation from within of the inmost secrets of the very being of God Himself.

Our natural instinct is to bow in speechless adoration in response to this revelation. If anyone can believe that this expansion of the original theme came from any other hand than that of the Master Himself, let him believe it. I can only say that I cannot. I believe, therefore, that the witness of the Gospel is harmonious and complete; and that our Lord was consciously and deliberately during His earthly ministry binding men to Himself and to one another, in order that when He was lost to sight they might be His Body—the instrument through the ages for the spread of His Kingdom throughout the world. I believe also that He summed up the teaching of the discourse which St. John has recorded when he gave His disciples their commission to go and make disciples of all the nations by baptizing them into (not *in*) the Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

J. O. F. Murray.

THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND

This is the only miracle which is recorded by all four evangelists. It is also, according to Westcott, the only incident in our Lord's life before His last visit to Jerusalem which is recorded by all four. Here, then, we have an unique opportunity of comparing the way in which each of them treats the same incident; and it is a simple incident. The outline of the story is clear, and the details, though they vary, do not contradict one another. (The walking on the water, which forms a sort of appendix in three of the accounts, is left out of consideration because it does not appear in Luke.) What light does a comparison throw upon the methods of the four writers?

It is clear that we have here, not four narratives of equal independent value, but two (Matthew and Luke) which are

secondary and depend upon one of the others (Mark), and two (Mark and John) which have every appearance of having been derived from separate sources. Matthew and Luke follow Mark closely, in each case with variations in detail, but not always the same variations. Thus Luke mentions, while Matthew does not, the fact that the people were marshalled in orderly companies of fifty, which seems to have made a great impression upon Mark. But the important point is that neither Matthew nor Luke introduce any detail which is not found in Mark, while Mark has picturesque details—*e.g.*, the green grass and the two hundred pence—which neither Matthew nor Luke have thought it worth while to reproduce. Their accounts are considerably shorter than Mark's. They condense and, as it were, generalize. They omit details, and they treat their source with a certain amount of freedom. It is not simply copied out. They reduce and to some extent rewrite, but they add nothing.

Thus the real interest lies in the comparison of the narratives of Mark and John, which are approximately of the same length.

It is easy to see that we have here two independent accounts. They resemble one another in the fact that both have a certain quality of vividness which is absent from Matthew and Luke, but the account in John is enriched with a number of details which do not appear in Mark. Thus, instead of " His disciples " generally, Philip and Andrew are introduced by name, and each of them makes a separate contribution to the story. The loaves are specified as *barley* loaves. The *lad* with the loaves is a new figure. There is a definite instruction from our Lord that the fragments are to be gathered up " that nothing be lost." It is also to be noted that the word used for fishes (ὀψαρια) only occurs in the New Testament here and in John xxi.

Where did all these new details come from ? The natural explanation is that they are derived from an eye-witness' vivid memory of a striking scene. The account in Mark is vivid, too: that is characteristic of all he writes; but here we have an intensified vividness. If there is any truth in the tradition that Mark represents the memories of Peter (and there seems to be no good reason to distrust it), he, too, takes us back to the original scene; but it is set one stage back. The eye-witness is obscured by the figure of the recorder. In John, on the other hand, we seem to have the eye-witness' own account of what he saw. He is his own recorder. If this is the case, it looks as if we had in John and Mark two eye-witness' accounts, one at first and one at second hand. The suggestion that Mark himself may have been present cannot be ruled out as beyond

the bounds of possibility, but it is a mere speculation, with nothing to support it. At all events, whether it was Peter who saw and Mark who recorded, or Mark who both saw and recorded, we get back to the testimony of an eye-witness.

There are two details which occur both in Mark and in John, but are absent from Matthew and Luke. They are both the sort of details which would have interested anyone who was actually present, but have no particular importance of their own. A writer who wished to use Mark's account and at the same time to condense it would be likely to leave them out. One of these details is the estimate of the value of the loaves that would be required to satisfy the multitude—two hundred pennyworth. The exact value is not a point of real importance. The magnitude of the scale upon which the food was provided is sufficiently indicated by the number of those who shared it. The other detail is in itself almost enough to create a presumption that the account came from an eye-witness. In John it is simply said that "there was much grass in the place": in Mark the people are described as reclining "upon the green grass." Here, again, the detail is unimportant in itself: but in vi. 32 we have been told that our Lord and His disciples had withdrawn to "a desert place," and it seems possible that the abundance of grass was something unexpected, something which an eye-witness would note, and no one but an eye-witness be likely to mention. Moreover, Mark uses twice over a very unusual form of expression—the simple repetition of a word to give emphasis (whether it is the imitation of an Aramaic idiom or not)—*συμπόσια συμπόσια*, and *πράσιαι πράσιαι*, and the word *πράσιαι* is in itself a very unusual one. He compares the seated companies to the beds in a neatly-ordered garden, or the reference may be to the bright colours of their garments. At all events the scene produced a vivid impression, and the description can hardly have emanated from anyone except one who was there to see and had a keen eye for the picturesque.

The details which are peculiar to Mark and John respectively serve to strengthen the impression derived from the two details which they have in common, but which are absent from Matthew and Luke. They look as if they had come from eye-witnesses. That is not equivalent to saying that both accounts were written by eye-witnesses. It is unlikely, though not altogether beyond the bounds of possibility, that Mark can have been present; but we may rely with some confidence upon the tradition that he got his information from Peter, who certainly was present. He is therefore the recorder of an eye-witness' experience. But what are we to say about

the account in the Fourth Gospel? If Mark is vivid, John is still more so. He is lavish of his details. Whence did he derive them? Was he present himself? Is he both witness and recorder? If he was not, does he stand in the same relation to the original witness as Mark stands to Peter, or are we to suppose that he was a later writer of great dramatic power who drew upon his imagination to elaborate a well-known story in order to bring out its spiritual significance?

The answer to the first of these questions must be that we have here nothing to contradict and much which supports the claim which the writer of the Fourth Gospel makes elsewhere to have been a contemporary and an intimate associate of our Lord. He writes exactly as we should expect a person to write who was present and who possessed the power of accurate observation and vivid description.

The second question is not one upon which the consideration of a single isolated passage can throw much light. It cannot be answered without going much further afield.

But some light ought to be thrown upon the answer to the third question by a careful consideration of the character of of the special Johannine details. Is there anything suspicious about them, anything forced, anything unnatural? If the question is to be honestly answered, the evidence must be weighed on its merits, without importing into its consideration any judgments which may have been formed from the examination of other incidents. We want to know what conclusion we should come to from the examination of this particular incident taken by itself. It is a part of the evidence on which any general conclusion as to the character of the details in the whole gospel must be based.

Into any judgment of this kind it is inevitable that a subjective element must enter, and that where the conclusion reached is not obvious that subjective element may play a large part. Even when one conclusion seems obvious to one critic, a very different conclusion may seem obvious to another. The whole of the gospel has been scrutinized with the utmost intensity, and the most opposite conclusions have been reached. Thus Lightfoot's conclusion is that "whatever touchstone we apply, the Fourth Gospel vindicates itself as a trustworthy narrative, which could only have proceeded from a contemporary and an eye-witness" (*Biblical Essays*, p. 39): to Loisy, "Les récits de Jean ne sont pas une histoire, mais une contemplation mystique de l'évangile": while Schmiedel is hard put to it to discover here and there a rare historical fact. Here we have three very different impressions produced upon three powerful intellects of different orders, the truth of which is

not susceptible of direct proof or disproof by ratiocination. At the same time, any impression which is worth consideration must be a rational impression, and therefore in some degree amenable to rational criticism. Moreover, it seems fair to maintain that where a set of statements seem *prima facie* to suggest a natural interpretation, the *onus probandi* lies with those critics who suggest an interpretation which is not natural. This is a consideration which many critics seem to ignore. They are deeply impressed by the indisputable contrast between the synoptic record and that in the Fourth Gospel: they take it for granted that it is to the synoptics that we must go for a portrait of "the Jesus of history": they explain the contrast, which they assume also to be a contradiction, by the suggestion that in the one case we have facts and in the other symbolism, and having got so far they turn back upon the text and exercise their ingenuity to discover allegorical significance in the minutest details of what appear to be at first sight simple statements of fact. Their whole case rests upon the assumption that the contrast is necessarily also a contradiction. But the matter is not so simple as that. It is not a case of a simple dilemma—either the synoptic account is the true one or the Johannine. Account has to be taken of the possibility that we may here have, not two contradictory accounts, but two contrasting but complementary presentations of the same superabundantly rich and many-sided life and character. In spite of the strong trend of modern criticism in the opposite direction, many people will not be inclined to accept the reduced estimate of the historical value of the Fourth Gospel without a great deal more evidence than has ever yet been produced that if the synoptic account is true the account in the Fourth Gospel must necessarily be, if true, true in quite a different sense.

If, then, we approach this particular narrative with an open mind, asking simply what is to be learnt from it as it stands by itself, without importing into our enquiry any impressions derived from any other source, what are we to say of it?

It seems, on the face of it, to be a true story, simple and straightforward. If it were not, we should expect it to bear suspicious marks. The hand of the inventor ought to betray itself in his workmanship. Is there any sign of it here? It is difficult to detect it. It is hard to see what doctrinal significance the introduction of Philip and Andrew by name instead of the disciples generally can have, or the fact that the loaves were *barley* loaves, or that it was *a lad* who had them. And surely it would be a stretch of imagination to suppose that the words "that nothing be lost" are put into our Lord's mouth just to emphasize the warning against waste which is already

inculcated in each of the four accounts by the mention of the fact that twelve baskets of "broken pieces" were taken up. These details ring true: they suggest no subtle ulterior design on the part of the writer. They seem to imply that what we are dealing with here is a simple, straightforward narrative, emanating from a writer with the gift of telling a true story in a dramatic fashion. It would surely be quite gratuitous to suggest that, even if he had no deeper motive, he may have invented natural-looking details just to heighten the effect of his narrative. There is no justification for such a supposition to be found in this passage taken by itself, and certainly the impression derived from the rest of the gospel is that it is the work of a writer who is too much in deadly earnest to play tricks of that kind.

If we take the four accounts* of this incident by themselves, ignoring any impressions we may have formed from anything else in the respective gospels, it seems that they may be arranged in a sort of ascending scale of value. Matthew and Luke stand lowest, as being demonstrably derived from Mark. Mark's account produces the impression of being derived from an eye-witness, though we know from elsewhere that in all probability he was not himself that eye-witness. This impression is still stronger in the case of John. His account is still more vivid than Mark's, and bears every indication of being the first-hand description of a scene at which the writer himself was actually present.

This arrangement almost reverses the very commonly accepted estimate of the historical value of the respective gospels, according to which John stands, not highest, but lowest in the scale. No doubt it would be precarious to draw sweeping conclusions as to the general character of the gospels from a comparison of their treatment of a single isolated incident, but such a comparison has a value as far as it goes, and forms part of the evidence upon which any general conclusion must be based.

L. V. Lester-Garland.

ISAAC OF NINEVEH ON PRAYER AND PRACTICE

Isaac of Nineveh, solitary of the later years of the seventh century, like the earlier Egyptian anchorites, out of the depths of his own experience left precious teachings to posterity.

* The four passages in question are: Matt. xiv. 15-21; Mark. vi. 31-44; Luke ix. 12-17; John vi. 5-13.

The ways of spiritual adventure do not change, only their external manifestation, and modern readers may well learn from the penetrating wisdom and marvel at the psychological grasp of these old writers.

Little need be said, or indeed can be told, of the history of Mar Isaac. He was born near the Persian Gulf, entered a monastery, and in some way attracted the attention of the Nestorian metropolitan, Mar George, who induced him to accept consecration as Bishop of Nineveh. After five months' experience of the episcopal office he resigned his See "for God knows what reason," says the old chronicler, and retired to a distant mountain, where he lived as an anchorite and devoted himself to the exercises of the solitary life, to study and to writing.

The treatises of Mar Isaac which have been preserved were edited for publication in 1909 by Paul Bedjan.* They are not only prolix and full of repetitions, like most Syriac writings, but they are difficult in style, so much so that the omission of many passages in a Greek translation was probably owing to this fact. A complete translation into English of Bedjan's printed text was made in 1923 by A. J. Wensinck.† Unfortunately he had but an academic and deficient knowledge of the English language, and in consequence his text is characterized by awkward constructions, by quaintly invented forms, such as renunciate, reclusion, and emotionability, and more seriously by the selection of the wrong dictionary definition of many words. On the whole, however, the meaning can be followed fairly well. The chief difficulty for a modern reader lies in the absence of systematic arrangement and of sequence in composition by the original author. This is somewhat compensated in the English version by a topical index.

Mar Isaac was a Nestorian, but the few passages which contain heretical or unorthodox statements are easily detected, and in no way affect his spiritual teaching, which is unquestionably sound. His writings are suffused with the atmosphere of a simple faith, despite the impress of Greek thought with its constant recurrence to intellectual analysis. They bear also the stamp of Oriental mentality, result of Oriental life under despotic conditions. In one passage, for instance, he offers the example of a man who placates his harsh judge by submissiveness as an incentive to do likewise by God. On the other hand, his teaching is permeated by the spirit of dis-

* *Mar Isaacus Ninivita de perfectione religiosa*, Syriace ed., by Paul Bedjan. Paris, 1909. The quotations are translated from this text, and the page numbers refer to it.

† *Mystic Treatises by Isaac of Nineveh*, translated from Bedjan's Syriac text by A. J. Wensinck. Amsterdam, 1923.

interested service of God, as, for example, when he bids his disciples not to look for remuneration for their well-doing in this world and, if possible, not even to wish for reward in the world to come.

The question may well be asked as to how far the spiritual experience of a solitary may serve as example to souls living under modern conditions of life, in which solitude can hardly be said to exist. Mar Isaac gives the answer near the beginning of the first treatise in the published text. He says: "No one can draw near to God, save he who is far from the world. But as to this separation I do not mean departure from the body, but from the concerns of the body." The evident meaning of the writer is that solitude without inner detachment is of no avail; but we may adopt for ourselves another interpretation—namely, that solitude may be created within the soul through the sundering of attachments to the concerns of this world—and the example of unnumbered saints down the ages emphasizes the truth of this statement.

Notwithstanding the lack of arrangement in the writings of Mar Isaac, careful study reveals that the course of his teaching is more systematic than at first appears. He classifies his doctrine under two heads: theory and practice. Under theory he includes whatever pertains to the experience of contemplative prayer, and under practice the exercises of the ascetic life as the necessary condition of such prayer.

Mar Isaac points out the danger of desiring theory or contemplative prayer for the sake of the delight which it affords before the soul has practised mortification of the passions. The glorious ascent of prayer must be preceded by the suffering ascent of the cross. He quotes a practical warning often used by his contemporaries in this connection, which Wensinck thinks he borrowed from the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of Dionysius the Areopagite:

> "If the small pupil of the eye of thy soul has not been purified, do not venture to gaze upon the orb of the sun, lest thou be bereft of even thy accustomed sight, which is simple faith and humility, heartfelt praise and the lowly service within thy power, and thou be cast out into one of those spiritual realms that is darkness without God, like him who ventured to go into the wedding feast clad in soiled garments" (p. 17).

Despite full knowledge of the dangers involved in the quest, it is clear that for this master of the spiritual life the goal to be sought is the experience of ecstatic vision of God. He distinguishes between prayer that can be expressed or uttered

in words and the state beyond even what he calls pure or spiritual prayer, when all words cease and prayer passes into vision. He has a rare power of describing experiences that are ineffable and well-nigh incommunicable; and one of his finest passages tells of the passing from prayer into contemplative vision:

> " Sweetness in prayer is one thing and vision in prayer is quite another. The second is as far superior to the first as a mature man is superior to a little boy. It happens at times that words become sweet in the mouth, and a single word of prayer is repeated times without number without feeling of weariness that would lead to forsaking it and passing on to another. And it also happens that out of prayer there arises a certain contemplation that interrupts the utterance of prayer by the lips; and through what he beholds, the man becomes like a corpse without breath, in a stupor (of ecstasy). This we call vision through prayer, and not some likeness or appearance delineated by fancy, as fools say. In this contemplation through prayer there are degrees and diversities of gifts. But up to this point (where contemplation begins) there is still prayer; thought has not yet passed into that (state) which is not prayer, but something superior to it. For the motions of the tongue and the heart in prayer are keys. That which comes after them is the entering into the treasure-house. Here, then, all mouths and tongues fall silent, and the heart, the treasure-guardian of the thoughts, and the reason, the ruler of the senses, and the mind, that swift, daring bird, and all their instruments and powers and persuasive arguments perforce stand still, for the master of the house has come " (pp. 164-165).

We may now turn from Mar Isaac's teaching on *theory* to consider what he has to say on *practice*, or the training and preparation for this spiritual prayer that leads to vision; since, in his own words, " for the entering of the mind behind the curtain of the holy of holies " a man " must pay duty, or God is not willing to grant it, even if the whole creation should beseech in behalf of him " (p. 519).

First of all the man must prepare for the assaults of spiritual foes, and hence he needs instruction on the nature of these attacks. In the beginning they are likely to be terrifying, severe as a hurricane, with the object of turning the man aside from a path that appears fraught with overwhelming danger. But if Satan finds him blazing with fervour, confident on account

of his faith in God, that tempter will withdraw, watching for an abatement of zeal. This will not come, if the man keeps close to the source of his strength; for if God withdraws Himself from time to time it is for the sake of training:

> "As a mother who is teaching her little son to walk places him at a distance from herself and calls him to come to her. But when the boy starts toward his mother on his little tottering feet, they tremble from weakness, and when the child begins to fall, the mother runs and lifts him in her arms. So does the grace of God uphold and train those children of men who sincerely and simply commit their souls into the hands of Him who created them, and with their whole hearts forsake the world to follow after Him" (pp. 273-274).

Mar Isaac goes on to explain that the tempter's tactics change as the man advances in experience and begins to gain confidence. Then Satan stirs him to thoughts of presumption, tempting him to attribute to his own strength his powers of resistance. If this onslaught fails, the evil one may bring before his inner sight pictured imaginations of worldly scenes and fantastic memories, pressing upon him evil temptations which he had thought to put far from him when he embraced solitude. But the man is in no wise to be discouraged.

> "If thou fall into temptations, lose not hope. There is no merchant travelling by sea and land who does not suffer losses; there is no husbandman who garners all his crop; there is no athlete who does not suffer blows and wounds, even if he gain the victory in the end. So it is in the things of God, with those who are merchantmen on the invisible way: they experience gains and losses, blows and victory. When thou art smitten, turn not thy back" (p. 565).

There is a fine passage shewing that the trials and temptations which a man endures must be regarded as proportionate to the measure of his gifts:

> "According to the greatness of the gifts is the severity of the temptations which God brings to the soul. In the case of a weak soul, that cannot bear much hardness, God deals gently with it, but let wisdom shew thee that since it cannot bear a hard temptation, so it can have no great gift. As great temptations have been withheld from it, so likewise great gifts. God never gives great gifts and small temptations. So temptations are to be

> reckoned as proportionate to gifts. Therefore from the hardships providentially ordered for thee thou mayest understand the measure of the greatness which thy soul has attained. In proportion to the suffering is the consolation" (p. 298).

Scattered throughout the nearly six hundred pages of these treatises is much wise and practical advice for the training of the solitary. For the purposes of this paper, quotations may be selected under three headings: penitential exercises, vocal prayer, and spiritual reading.

Mar Isaac conceives the whole course of man Godward as being threefold, consisting in repentance, purity, and perfection:

> "What is repentance? The putting away of former (sins) and suffering for them. What is purity? A heart compassionate toward all created things. What is perfection? The depths of humility, which is the forsaking of all things visible and invisible" (p. 507).

The author defines repentance as "constant prayerful lamentation in contrite prayer offered to God for the forgiveness of what is past, with petition for protection in the future." In reply to the question as to when a man may believe that he has received forgiveness for his sins, the answer is given: "When he is inwardly conscious that he hates them with his whole heart and that he openly reverses his previous way of life." It is quoted with approval that for forty years the prayer of a certain father consisted in one sentence: "I have sinned as man, do Thou forgive me as God."

Mar Isaac sees as clearly as any scholastic that all good things in the spiritual life "are mediated by baptism and faith," and he, too, reckons repentance as a second grace:

> "Repentance is a second birth from God. That which we received as a pledge in baptism, we receive as a gift through repentance. . . . Repentance is a second grace born in the heart from faith and fear" (p. 315).

And he uses this illustration:

> "As no one can cross the great ocean without boat or ship, so no man can pass over to love except by fear. That stagnant sea which is placed between us and the mystical paradise we may cross in the boat of repentance, which has fear as the rudder. If the rudder of fear does not govern the ship of repentance, in which we cross

> the sea of this world on our way to God, we shall be drowned in that stagnant sea. The ship is repentance; fear controls her, and love is the divine port " (p. 317).

The passages in these treatises that concern the practice of prayer are so numerous that it is difficult to make a choice for quotation. The ascetic life, says Mar Isaac, is " the mother of saintliness "; and again: " The whole ascetic way is summed up in prayer without ceasing."

> " When a man has attained to this, he has reached the summit of all virtue, and has henceforth a spiritual dwelling-place. Unless the man has truly received the gift of the Comforter, he has not attained to this constant prayer which is accomplished in quiet peace. But when he is indwelt by the Spirit, he does not cease from prayer, for the Spirit constantly prays in him. Whether he sleeps or whether he wakes, prayer is not cut off from his soul. Whether he eats or drinks, whether he lies down to sleep or occupies himself about anything, and even when he is immersed in slumber, the fragrance of prayer rises without effort within his heart. Henceforward he does not possess prayer at limited times, but always, and when he has outward rest, even then prayer is ministered to him secretly. The silence of the serene soul is prayer, says the man who is clothed in Christ " (p. 259).

Concerning answers to the prayer of petition, Mar Isaac counsels that a man should not ask for what God undoubtedly will provide, since " your Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." If any prayer seems to be unanswered, there must be no distress:

> " Either the ways of thy heart diverge from the aim of thy prayer, or thy hidden state is childish compared to the greatness of the thing (thou desirest). It is not fitting that great things should fall easily into our hands, lest the gift of God be held of little account, as being obtained without difficulty " (pp. 33-34).

And again with reference to a man that asks for divine help:

> " God the merciful will necessarily delay granting his petitions, that he may have the more reason for drawing near to Him. Because of his need he will remain constantly close to the fountain of help, and God will grant some of his petitions quickly and some not. God grants those which he knows to be necessary for life, and the rest He delays " (p. 107).

Mar Isaac knows that the more a man feels the need of divine grace the more he will pray, and he shews that the act of prayer begets a humble attitude:

> "As soon as a man humbles himself, straightway mercy surrounds and embraces him; and as soon as mercy draws near, the heart experiences help, because confidence and strength vibrate within it. When it perceives the approach of divine help within it and that God is its support and helper, then at once the heart is filled with faith. Henceforth it will understand and know that prayer is the port of help, the fountain of salvation, the treasure of confidence, a sheet-anchor in storms, light in darkness, the staff of the weak, shelter in time of temptation, healing in time of sickness, the shield of protection in battle, and a sharp arrow against the adversary" (p. 105).

The relation between the reading of Holy Scripture and prayer is made clear: "Through reading the soul is enlightened in prayer." The light of the soul consists in constant meditation upon the Scriptures, which "trace before us the way made peaceful by the steps of the saints." But the reading must be continually accompanied by watching and prayer, lest it be useless, for spiritual experience cannot be learned "through human teachings or snatched from writings." With a touch of humour the question is put: "Can these things be known from ink?"

Reading is to include the writings of those who teach the straight and "narrow ways of the ascetic life, contemplation and the stories of the saints, even though at first no delight in them is experienced." The choice of reading is to be according to the progress of the soul:

> "Not all books serve for recollection of mind. Many books of instruction are not useful for the purification of the heart. Disturbing books will leave thee with a wandering mind. Know that all books which teach the fear of God are also useful for the purification of the conscience and recollection of thought" (pp. 476-477).

The solitary is especially warned against books which deal with doctrinal controversies. His reading is to be done in calm silence, that it may bring sweetness and profit to the soul: "Do not account words that are the fruit of experience as the babbling of them that sell words, lest thou remain in darkness until the end of thy life."

The summing up of the matter may be given in this brief saying: "Constant meditation on holy writings will fill the soul with incomprehensible ecstasy and joy in God."

The psalter is, of course, treated not only as a source for meditation, but also as a book of praise and prayer, for so it had been used by all ascetics from the earliest days: "The recitation of psalms is the root of the ascetic way." Advice for a fruitful use of the psalms is found in a notable passage:

> "Dost thou desire to find delight in thy appointed recitation of the psalter and to savour the spirit of the words which thou recitest? Do not trouble about fulfilling a certain quantity or measuring the amount accomplished, but utter the words with the purpose of prayer, and let go the accustomed repetition. Understand what I say. That which is historical let thy mind look upon as an account of the acts of divine providence, so that by a mighty understanding of them thy soul be awakened to marvel at God's ruling, and so be moved either to praise or to profitable stirring of the affections. But those (passages) which are prayers take to thyself. . . . (Beware) lest the words of the psalms and prayers come as it were from one who is a stranger to their meaning; for thou must not think that thou art sharing intensely in the work of the apostles, if thou art altogether without the fervour and joy which it brings. But as originating from thyself, thou shouldest say the words beseechingly, as an offering of intelligent fervour from one who is truly persuaded that he is occupied with a work of his own. Dejection is caused by distraction of mind and distraction by neglect of labours and of reading and by careless ways" (pp. 382-383).

We must recall that all the practices of the ascetic life which have been considered are held by Mar Isaac to be the means of purification for the attainment of that perfection of the soul which consists for him in the ecstatic vision of the contemplative. The man who is persevering with this aim must not be discouraged if he experience many hindrances and distractions, causing variations in his inner state. Quoting blessed Macarius, he says:

> "What then? Vicissitudes happen to every man, like varying winds. Understand—to every man, for nature is one. Do not think he is speaking only of the imperfect and that the perfect are free from vicissitudes, and remain in one state without swerving, and without

movement of the passions. . . . There may be intense cold, and after a little while heat; or perhaps hail, and soon afterwards a clear sky. This is for our instruction. For in like manner strife is followed by the help of grace. At times the soul is in rough weather, assailed by heavy seas. And then there comes a change and the visitation of grace. Joy fills the heart, and peace from God, with sober, calming thoughts " (pp. 495-496).

The state, but rarely reached, toward which Mar Isaac desires to guide the contemplative he thus describes:

> " It is the mystic counterpart of the future state, in which nature is lifted up and rendered exempt from all motions that arise from the memory of the things of this world. There is no praying of prayers, but the soul has experimental knowledge of the spiritual things of that other world, which are far beyond man's comprehension, the knowledge of them being stirred in him by the power of the Spirit. It is intellectual sight, and not the motions and beseeching of prayer. However, it has its origin in prayer. Because such men have already become utterly pure and because at all times the powers of their mind are stirring in prayer, whenever the Spirit looks upon them He finds them in prayer, and thence can guide them by means of contemplation, which is by interpretation spiritual vision. They do not need prolonged prayer or much ordered observance. They only need the recollection of God, and straightway, as it were in captivity, they are led by love " (p. 260).

We are not surprised that Mar Isaac, in his humility, tells his readers that he has not been found worthy of experiencing in his own person one-thousandth part of that which his hands have written down; but we may well be convinced that he could not have given his penetrating descriptions of that which it is not possible for a man to utter in human language had he not himself had deep experience in the ways of ineffable communion with God.

MOTHER MARY MAUDE, C.S.M.

MISCELLANEA

ST. AUGUSTINE'S THEORY OF KINGSHIP

"THIS vocation of politics," said *The Times* of May 13, 1937, referring to the King's anointing and crowning, "is the noblest of all human callings: its business is not with the market-place but with the stars: it is still what it was to Plato, to St. Augustine, to Sir Thomas More. Its purpose is no less than the building of the City of God." In view of the enormous publicity recently given to the Christian conception of monarchy, it is of some interest to look back to the idea of kingship implied in St. Augustine's scattered observations on the subject, and to compare it with that expressed in our Coronation sermons and articles.

The political situation in which St. Augustine found himself undoubtedly exercised a profound influence on his thought. While he was still a child, the last formidable attempt of Græco-Roman paganism to reassert itself failed with the death of Julian, and the emperor never again appeared in the rôle of a heathen persecutor. During that supremely critical period of his life, his sojourn at Milan, he was a deeply impressed spectator of the triumph of the orthodox bishop over the Arian ruler; he witnessed the recurrent defeats of Symmachus' pagan party caused by Ambrose's immense influence at the imperial court, and he had seen Ambrose as the protector of the royal family against Maximus. We might expect that, as a result of these ecclesiastical triumphs, he would be inclined to exalt the temporal power of the Church in opposition to the emperors; but, by the time he succeeded to his bishopric, the situation was profoundly different. Theodosius had long ago appeared as the Church's protector against pagans and heretics, it was as the "Defender of the Faith" that he had won the battle of the Frigidus, and his successors followed the same policy of proving themselves to be indeed "ministers of God" and "avengers for wrath to him that doeth evil." It was an obvious political necessity for the emperor, during this time of the empire's disintegration, to support the established faith—which might in a very real sense be termed "Roman" Catholicism—against the heresies which so often provided centres and symbols of loyalty for nationalist movements in the provinces. Indeed, Catholic Christianity was now taking the place of the imperial cult as the spiritual bond uniting the diverse races of the empire in much the same way as devotion to the Throne unites the British Commonwealth. Nowhere was this fact more strikingly demonstrated than in St. Augustine's own country, where Donatism supplied at once a pretext and a spiritual focus for a Punic nationalism which became really formidable at the time of Gildo's revolt, and he naturally saw in the emperor Catholicism's greatest ally against the schismatics and their redoubtable "storm-troops" the Circumcelliones, just as the emperor regarded the Church as a political instrument of very real value. It is hardly surprising that St. Augustine, with the evidence of Honorius' anti-Donatist edicts before his eyes, should forget the impression of the imperial power which he must have received at Milan and be inclined to find in the emperor the God-given protector of the Church and governor of the world.

His theory of monarchy is, indeed, a kind of synthesis of the Roman imperial idea as it had developed by the end of the fourth century and a Christian doctrine of the kingship largely derived from the Old Testament, and such a synthesis was not hard to make, for the two ideas are in many ways akin, and both are ultimately Eastern in origin. In contrast with its Republican guise, the essential character of the Empire, even in the time of Augustus, was derived from the Hellenistic monarchies, and, through them, from the ancient Oriental despotisms. The emperor was the φιλάνθρωπος βασιλεύς in Roman dress, and, in the East, he was soon openly recognized as the "god made manifest," whose benevolent control extended to every aspect of his subject's lives. Even Seneca speaks of the emperor as chosen to act in the place of the gods,* and such language becomes more and more common by the time of Constantine, in spite of the democratic theory of the principate enunciated by the jurists and maintained even so late as the Codex Theodosii;† the "civilitas" of the early emperors had been replaced by as full a consciousness of royal majesty as was ever held by the Great King of Persia. The Church, on its side, had developed its own conception of the divine sanction of the earthly rules. The New Testament's injunctions to obey the civil authority on the ground of its divine appointment are constantly reiterated by the Fathers.

Theophilus declares that Christians ought to honour the emperor because his power is given him by God,‡ and Irenæus suggests that even evil kings are divinely ordained as a punishment for simple men. Thus, as soon as it became clear that the emperor's power was to be exercised for, and not against, the Church, Christians began to ascribe to this God-appointed prince the virtues of the anointed king of Israel as he was ideally regarded in the Scriptures—the upholder and guardian of the divine law, the protector and leader of God's people. Once this conception of the monarch became established, it was not difficult, as the golden throne of Nicæa and Eusebius' adulations testify, to unite it with the pagan idea of the emperor as the world's saviour and governor, and, though the ideal of the Christian king maintaining the Catholic Church's doctrines with the might of the law received a severe check in the reigns of the Arianizing Constantius and Valens, not to speak of Julian's reversion to paganism, the orthodox rule of Theodosius restored its strength, though Ambrose declared that only the good ruler is God's minister§ and that the emperor himself is subject to the bishop in matters relating to the faith.‖ Ambrosiaster actually goes so far as to say, "Rex enim adoratur in terris quasi vicarius Dei";¶ but it was in Africa, where the emperor was the champion at once of Roman civilization and orthodox Christianity, that advanced ideas of the rights and duties of Christian kings could most easily grow up. Optatus, replying to the Donatist slogan "Quid est imperatori cum ecclesia?" asserts that "cum super imperatorem non sit nisi solus Deus, qui fecit imperatorem, dum se Donatus super imperatorem extollit, iam quasi hominum excesserat metas, ut se Deum non hominem aestimaret, non reverendo eum qui post Deum ab hominibus timebatur."**

With this view that the emperor is responsible to God alone, and that

* De Clem i., i.
† "De auctoritate iuris nostra pendet auctoritas."
‡ Ad Aut. i., ii.
§ Exp. Ev. St. Luke iv. 5.
‖ Ep. xxi.
¶ 1 Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. 91.
** De Schisma Donat. iii. 3.

he governs by divine right, St. Augustine seems, despite a hint in the "Confessions" of a theory of social contract, to be generally in agreement. Theocracy lies at the very root of all his political thought, and from it his theory of kingship is derived. Human monarchy is but a temporal institution ordained for fallen man's guidance, which will ultimately pass away. It is not in accordance with man's original or ideal nature; its purpose is relative to humanity's fallen condition and is punitive or remedial. "God," he says, "did not intend that his rational creature, who was made in his image, should have dominion over anything but the irrational creation—not man over man, but man over the beasts. Hence the righteous men in primitive times were made shepherds of cattle rather than kings of men, God intending thus to teach us what the relative position of the creatures is, and what the desert of sin."* Ultimately, "all principality and every human power shall be brought to nothing, and God be all in all."† Only through the personal rule of God can justice be established among men; hence he omits from Cicero's definition of a state the words "iuris consensu (sociatum)," for he can well conceive of a state existing which did not acknowledge the rule of God and therefore did not possess true justice.‡

This belief in theocracy leads him to regard the king as the agent through whom it is exercised. The ruler owes his power to God and must render account for his government, he must behave humbly towards God as his own supreme ruler: "The more exalted kings are in earthly eminence, the more ought they to humble themselves before God. . . . Do kings desire that He have respect unto them? Let them be humble: 'For the Lord is high and hath respect unto the lowly.'"§ Commenting, in the Enchiridion, on 1 Tim. ii. 3-4, he says: "It is the king's special duty and task to resist the temptation of arrogance and conduct himself as the servant of God." The king is ideally the guardian and servant of all; in the City of God the princes and the subjects "serve one another in love, the latter obeying while the former take thought for all," whereas in the earthly city "the princes, and the nations the city subdues, are ruled by the love of ruling."‖ In his view the king holds an almost priestly position as the mediator of the theocracy and the appointed servant of the community, and his conception of the Christian king is thus the same as that which the English Coronation Order expresses.

But St. Augustine's doctrine has its less attractive side. He confuses the divine institution of civil government with the divine approval by God of each individual ruler, good or bad. With regard to pagan emperors, his position is similar to that of St. Paul or St. Peter: "There is indeed," he declares, "a Cæsar, a human king in men for things human, but another King for things divine. . . . It is not because they had Cæsar for king that the Jews sinned, but because they would not have Christ."¶ In a remarkable passage in the *De Catechizandis Rudibus* he compares Jerusalem and Babylon with the heavenly and earthly cities, and the Captivity, the peace enjoyed in Babylon, and the conversion of its kings is likened to the Church's subjection to pagan rulers, their conversion, and the quiet enjoyed by Christians under their government; that is to say, obedience to heathen emperors has been rewarded by their conversion. Elsewhere he claims that, since the Church has from the beginning rendered due service to earthly kings and prayed for

* De Civ. Dei, xix. 15. † *Ibid.* ‡ *Ibid.* xix. 24.
§ In Ps. cxxxviii. 4, 9-11. ‖ De Civ. Dei, xiv. 28. ¶ In Ps. lvi. 2.

them, it can truly declare, " Princes have persecuted me without a cause."*

But he is carried so far by his doctrine of divine right as to maintain, like Irenæus, that the rule of every bad king is willed by God, and that wicked rulers must therefore be obeyed. " Sometimes," we read in his commentary on the verse " For the Lord will not leave the rod of the ungodly upon the lot of the righteous," " the unrighteous arrive at worldly honours; when they . . . have been made judges or kings—for God does this for the discipline of his people—the honour due to their power must needs be shewn to them . . . and sometimes from those who are better than those in power."†

St. Augustine does not shrink from the application of this theory to concrete historical situations: " He who gave power to Marius gave it also to Gaius Cæsar; he who gave it to Augustus gave it to Nero; he who gave it to the Christian Constantine gave it also to the apostate Julian."‡ To justify this view of theocracy he falls back either upon the inscrutability of God's justice§ or upon the explanation that " it is not unjust that by wicked men's reception of power of doing evil, the patience of the good should be tested, and the iniquity of the wicked should be punished."‖ Apparently he would not admit the morality even of the peaceful removal of a monarch from his throne, still less of an insurrectionary movement, but he allows disobedience to an anti-Christian ruler in matters pertaining directly to the Faith. Christians disobeyed Julian in religious matters, " but whenever he commanded them to deploy, to march against this or that nation, they at once obeyed. They distinguished their everlasting from their temporal master, yet they were, for the sake of their everlasting master, submissive to their temporal master."¶ This interesting distinction between secular and religious conformity would undoubtedly appeal strongly to the Lutheran Church in its present situation; St. Augustine does not, however, enlarge upon it.

Of course, when the king is a Christian this obedience is urged upon men in order that they may be trained as citizens of heaven. The king is then the servant of God and the leader of his people in the way of righteousness—a true Christian monarch. It will therefore be his most important duty to promote the Church's welfare. But even this attractive picture has its dark side, though, in view of the African situation, this does not surprise us. According to St. Augustine, it is the prince's duty, by virtue of his position as the agent of God, to repress heathens and heretics, if necessary by force. He says that his opponents complain of unfair treatment " because the heretics have suffered the penalty of laws for the fury of their deeds . . . again because it has been resolved that laws should be passed against the pagans, or rather for them. . . . For as when silly boys play with mud and dirty their hands the strict master comes, shakes the mud out of their hands and holds out their book, so it has pleased God by the hand of princes to terrify their foolish hearts, that they may throw away the dirt from their hands, and set about something useful."** To Petilian's objections that the Catholics are acting illogically in having dealings with kings, and that they are arming the rulers against their fellow-Christians, he replies that " Kings, from the very fact that they are kings, have a service which they can render to the Lord in a manner that is impossible for any who have not royal power,"

* In Ps. cxix. 161. † In Ps. cxxv. 3. ‡ De Civ. Dei v. 21.
§ *Ibid.* ‖ De Nat. Boni 32. ¶ In Ps. cxxv. 3. ** Serm. lxiii.

and continues by citing Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of the accusers of the Three Children as a precedent for righteous persecution. Kings must therefore "consider what decrees they ought to make . . . that the same God be not treated with scorn in their realm." Just as a child is punished for his own good, so kings persecute heretics for their own ultimate advantage.* But though this doctrine that the Christian prince must be a persecutor is easily derived from St. Augustine's theory of kingship, it is not its necessary corollary, and he himself changed his opinion on the matter. With him, as with us, the divine commission need not involve the use of the sword of Spiritual Justice for the extirpation of infidels and heretics. The truest expression of his idea of monarchy is the famous "Mirror of Princes" (*De Civ. Dei*, v. 24).

"We say that they are happy if they rule justly, if they are not exalted amid the praises of those who pay them sublime honours, and the obsequiousness of those who salute them with excessive humility, but remember that they are men . . . if they fear, love, and worship God . . . if they are slow to punish, ready to pardon; if they apply that punishment as necessary to the government and defence of the state, and not in order to gratify their own enmity; if they pardon, not that wickedness may go unpunished but with the hope that the transgressor may mend his ways . . . if they prefer to govern depraved desires rather than any nation and if they do all these things . . . through love of eternal felicity, not neglecting to offer the true God . . . for their sins the sacrifices of humility, contrition and prayer. Such Christian emperors, we say, are happy in the present time through hope, and are destined to be so in the enjoyment of the reality itself."

His curious selection of Constantine and Theodosius as embodiments of this ideal need not prejudice us against so remarkable a summary of his view of kingship. When all allowance has been made for the defects in his theories, and for the differences due to the fact that the kings to which he refers were absolute rulers, St. Augustine is no bad model for those who seek, in their expression of the Christian idea of monarchy, to avoid the secularization of the ruler's office on the one hand, and, on the other, the extravagant quasi-Messianism which would treat it almost as an extension of the Incarnation.

G. W. H. Lampe.

THE "ZOE" MOVEMENT

This is the name of a great movement of spiritual revival which is at work in the Church of Greece. In the words of one of its leaders, the objectives of the Society are to live Jesus Christ, to give His Life ("Zoe" means life) to others, to make His Good News of Life known to all our people by means of the preaching of the Word of Life, by instruction of the young in Catechetical Schools, and through the publication of good Christian literature. It is the firm conviction of the Zoe Brotherhood that only by the bringing of people into touch with the Life which is in Jesus Christ our Lord can the Church serve humanity and accomplish her destiny in the world.

The Brotherhood was formed by a certain Archimandrite Evsebius

* Resp. ad Petilianum, II., xcii., xciv.

Matthopoulos, who died in 1929, and a small group of four theologians, all of them doctors of the Theological Faculty of the University of Athens, three of whom survive. It was founded in 1907, but was hardly known until the publication began in 1911 of its weekly periodical, " ZOE," on the first page of which appear five texts from the Gospel of St. John, sayings of Jesus Christ about LIFE.

The Brotherhood is an organization more or less monastic in character, but while its membership is restricted to unmarried men, these are not obliged to take formal vows of celibacy, but have the right to withdraw from the Brotherhood whenever they wish to marry. Though they cease to be members of the Brotherhood, they remain " friends " of the Society, and some of these have rendered more valuable service to the Society as friends than they did as members. The Brotherhood is organized on a system of communal living and has as its leader (Abbot) a cleric who holds his position for life. After the death of the founder, Evsebius, who was the first Father Superior and Director, the Archimandrite Serapheim Papakostas succeeded to this position. He is a theological graduate of Athens University and a preacher in the Cathedral of Athens. In his administration of the Society, the Abbot is assisted by a council of four other Brothers.

The chief purpose of the Brotherhood has been from its inception that the members *should live* Christ in their lives, then that they should work for the awakening of the Christian life among their fellows. To this end their chief concerns are primarily preaching, then literary work, the office of confession, and catechetical instruction.

The Brotherhood has today twelve clerical and fifteen lay preachers, all of them graduates in or doctors of theology. Most of these are stationed in the provincial centres of Greece for definite periods, but they return to Athens and remain there for study and retreat during the summer. There are also about forty members who are theologians and thirteen helpers or workers, making a corps of about eighty. The clerical members decline persistently to accept ecclesiastical preferment, choosing rather the simple offices of preacher and confessor than high administrative office. And though the Society does not for any reason accept direct financial assistance, yet it has acquired its own building of fifty-three rooms, in which the Athenian members live and work, and where also they have their printing press, type-setting and book-binding rooms.

In endeavouring to give a picture of the work which ZOE is doing in Greece, first place should be given to the work of preaching the Gospel. From the first it has been the chief concern of the Brotherhood to find and train preachers. Men of suitable mind and spirit are usually found in the Divinity School of Athens, and are given a period of special training, first in the Catechetical Schools, where they learn to teach spiritual truths to young boys, then, during the summer months at their retreat at St. Paraskevi, they are given special training in the art of public speaking. They usually speak in the churches without notes, taking their themes from the Gospel or the Epistle of the day, and applying its teachings to the everyday life of their hearers. In the afternoon services the preachers in Athens usually take portions of the New Testament and treat them exegetically and practically. At both morning and evening services conducted by Dr. Trembelas and Father Serapheim the churches are crowded with people who willingly stand for an hour or more listening to the words which fall from the lips of these truly inspired men, and very

frequently Bishops and Clergy are present in the congregation. On one occasion six Bishops were observed listening to Dr. Trembelas—who, it may be mentioned incidentally, is sometimes seen at the services of the English Church in Athens. ZOE insists that what is most essential in a preacher of the Gospel is personal authority. He must inspire confidence that he is a protagonist and follower of the Gospel which he sets forth. Here are some of the obligations laid down by the Society as incumbent on its workers and members:

1. There must be complete devotion and consecration to the work of the Lord. There must be no looking back once a Brother has put his hand to the plough. ZOE will not harbour men who come for any other reason than to serve Christ.

2. Members must exhibit a life of true humility, absolutely free from egoism and pride, and a complete readiness to be subject to the known will of the leaders, and, above all, to the will of Christ. There must be absolute loyalty to the Brotherhood.

3. They must not be tempted by offers of promotion, but must be satisfied with great simplicity of life, food, clothing and shelter, and the simplest needs of living.

4. They must have courage to speak the truth, though the heavens fall. This virtue of courage is particularly needed in an environment where hate and passion rule so many people.

5. Everyone must be an example in word and deed, both to those within the Fellowship and those without. They must be particularly careful to avoid any word or action which might lead to scandal, and in their relations with women they must be above reproach.

One of the leaders explains that " We must teach those truths which the common hearer can understand and apply in his or her own life. We are more interested in the practical Christian life than in theological or historical problems. We must emphasize in our preaching the value of the truths of Holy Scripture, Jesus Christ as the Pattern and Saviour of mankind. We must join in the services of our Church, giving special attention to the Eucharist. We take Holy Communion frequently, and we are bringing back the practice of Confession into the life of our Church. We have few confessors, for we find it easier to train preachers than to develop confessors, since it requires much individual talent to become a proper confessor. The confessors of women and girls must be elderly, and those only who are tried and experienced. Only such as have a special talent for this calling are accepted. By means of confession, we help the inner lives of the people, and we also find out what they are thinking. This helps us as preachers to speak to the real needs of the people."

From the pulpit and in private the practice of family worship and of private devotions is strongly advocated. ZOE tries to bring back the use of the Bible and devotional literature into the Christian home.

ZOE has a special department devoted to the training of the young in Christian truth and practice. Father Panayotopoulos is in charge of it. For the past ten years catechetical instruction has formed part of the work of ZOE, and during this period has grown in extent, and in favour with clergy and laity. Perhaps this is due to the fact that within this period lessons on religion have decreased in the public schools of Greece, and thus the need for Sunday instruction has become greater. The Brotherhood has functioning in Athens and Piræus thirty-one

primary Catechetical Schools, eight Intermediate, and two High Schools, and the Brothers in the provinces have started many other Catechetical Schools. Altogether the Zoe Sunday Schools account for 300 teachers and over 30,000 students.

Books and material for instruction have been prepared for three grades of students, of Primary, Intermediate, and High School ages, after careful study of programmes and methods used in Sunday Schools of the West. Their object is to transplant the Sunday School system which has been so fruitful in other countries into the child life of Greece. During the past summer three new books on catechetical lessons have been prepared and published by ZOE, one for Lower Schools, another for Intermediate Schools, and an apologetic course for High Schools (Gymnasium students). During the great Christian festivals appropriate lessons are given on their significance and to help in their proper observance.

The teaching is given by graduates and students of theology, of whom very few are priests. Some of the teachers in the Athens area are trained in Teachers' Training Classes. The students also are trained to put their Christian ideas into practice by visiting and aiding various orphanages, hospitals, and other philanthropic institutions. They are encouraged to shew an interest in their poorer classmates, and to teach others the truths they learn. Music is taught in all the classes, using the grand hymns of the Church as well as more modern hymnals with Western music. The social side of life is emphasized by organizing excursions to famous sites, churches, and monasteries, where appropriate lectures are given along with lessons and games. The cost of these Catechetical Schools is entirely met by ZOE and its affiliated benevolent society, that of the Apostle Paul, consisting of friends and sympathizers of ZOE.

Since the publication of suitable material for instruction, and owing to the fact that the Sunday School idea is becoming popular in the Church, many Sunday Schools are being started in the provinces which use the ZOE material and are due to ZOE initiative, but are not under its direct leadership. These schools usually have the cordial support and fatherly care of the Diocesan Bishops. It is estimated that they provide for about 20,000 students.

ZOE has from the first been interested in the publication and circulation of Christian literature. It has published a New Testament (33,000 copies) approved by the Œcumenical Patriarch, and a Septuagint Edition of the Old Testament. Hymn books, Christian stories, tracts on the Christian life, lives of the Saints, apologetic literature, and many other religious books have been printed and published. Above all, they have published since 1911 a weekly periodical, " ZOE," which contains sermons, religious articles, serial stories, and comments on current events. This has a circulation of about 70,000 copies and goes to every corner of Greece and the Islands, as well as abroad. It is the most widely circulated Christian periodical in Greece. The Society has its own printing press and certain lay Brothers do the work of type-setting, printing, distribution etc., as well as undertaking the management of a bookstore. And as the expenses are low, the books can be sold at moderate prices. Dr. Trembelas is now working on a Commentary of the Epistles of St. Paul in which the ancient and modern texts will appear in parallel columns. It will be the first modern translation of the New Testament circulating with Synodical permission.

The influence and authority of ZOE are now well established in Greece, and its work and publications have the full official approval of the Holy Synod. At first its members were regarded as heretics and accused of being Protestant in tendency; but now the spirit of the Church has changed, and it is well understood that the motives and methods of ZOE are right, and its teachings, if considered liberal, are yet recognized as thoroughly orthodox. At a trial for heresy in 1923, Dr. Trembelas was vindicated and acquitted. Numbers are steadily growing, but the Society regards the quality of the workers as more important than mere numbers. Hence much time is given to the training of workers in order to imbue them with a spirit of Christian discipline, sacrifice, and service.

A large building has been purchased near the centre of Athens which is being used for meetings with University students at which religious and scientific problems are discussed. The Society intends to demolish the present building and put up in its place a modern one, which will provide rooms for meetings, a small chapel, and a lunch room, as well as lecture rooms for groups of students. In this way it is endeavouring to make a Christian impact upon the lives of students in the University of Athens, and at present it is the only Christian agency working among those students.

R. Richmond Raymer.

A FAMILY BUDGET: THE CRAWLEYS OF HOGGLESTOCK

There are few domestic economies so vividly portrayed in fiction as that of the Rev. Josiah Crawley, Perpetual Curate of Hogglestock in the Diocese of Barchester, who is immortalized by Anthony Trollope in *Framley Parsonage* (1861) and *The Last Chronicle of Barset* (1867). The poor, half-cracked priest is the real hero of the Barsetshire Series. All I propose to do in this note is to examine his yearly budget and to suggest that, as you would expect, he was a bad manager.

He appears first in *Framley Parsonage*, where his early struggles as a curate in Cornwall are told retrospectively. He was at Oxford with Dr. Arabin, his lifelong friend, but in spite of his wonderful scholarship, of which we are assured, was left to languish on a stipend of £70 a year. Neither he nor his wife, whom he married soon after being ordained, had any private means, and the birth of the four children, two of whom died, plunged them into debt. Arabin helped them constantly and finally paid Crawley's debts, and presented him with the living of Hogglestock, worth £130 a year. There we first see the family. Two babies have been born at Hogglestock, and it consists of Grace (aged nine), Bob (aged six), and the two babies.

At this period food was " used in quantities which any artisan would have regarded as compatible only with semi-starvation."

The Last Chronicle of Barset begins with the supposed theft of £20 by Mr. Crawley, which was really a gift from Mrs. Arabin, the Dean's wife. Dr. Arabin, now Dean of Barchester, had given him £50 lately, to which the £20 was surreptitiously added.

Three children are alive. Grace, aged nineteen, is teaching at a school at Silverbridge, where she gets her keep and a salary which at least enables her to " look nice." Bob is at school at Marlborough, probably at that date receiving free education as a foundationer. Any-

how, the Dean takes responsibility for him and his clothes. Jane, aged sixteen, is at home.

A pitiable description is given of the Rectory. There seems to be one living-room, the daughter, when disturbed by a visitor, retiring to the kitchen. The carpet has been literally worn out, so that nothing remains. The tables are broken. Mrs. Crawley shews in her face the traces of her poverty. This afflicted family of three people and a maid (it never occurs to them that two women might do the housework) consume 3 lbs. of meat a day at 9d. a lb., costing over £40 a year. Bread costs at least £25 a year, say 2s. 6d. a week per head. Mrs. Crawley had to put up with " the taunt of the poor servant who wants her wages," but the girl did not starve.

Now what was the family budget ? We are told that clothes cost £10 a head for five persons, but Grace must have clothed herself out of her £3 a month, and the Dean paid for Bob's clothes we are expressly told. Food has been already mentioned; wages were left unpaid. But what came into the house ? In the twelve months preceding the alleged theft we know of the following, to say nothing of frequent gifts in kind from Lady Lufton and others:

	£
Income of living	130
Value of house (say)	30
Given by Dean Arabin	50
Given by Mrs. Arabin	20
Sent home by Grace	6
Literary earnings	5
	£241

The last item refers to a payment by an " admiring magazine editor " for a translation into Greek irregular verse of " the very noble ballad of Lord Bateman." I know of no more poignant illustration of the cultural darkness in which we now live in comparison with the light of seventy years ago than that Trollope could have penned what seems to us so ludicrous a sentence. Now consider that rates and taxes would be negligible, prices were much below those of today, and that the onions used for the mutton broth, of which we read, presumably came with much else from the garden, the Crawleys' income from all sources was in the neighbourhood of £500 a year, translating it into terms of 1938.

We must conclude that Trollope wrote in the light of his middle-class comfort and did not criticize his own assumptions. The statement that the food consumed by the Crawleys would have seemed " semi-starvation " to an artisan is absurd. A Wiltshire labourer at that time was paid about 10s. a week. Grace, again, who looked " quite nice " at Miss Prettyman's school, and attracted Major Grantly as a suitor, when invited to visit Lily Dale at Allington, came home and spent weary hours in sewing " that she might not reach her friend's house in actual rags." No, we cannot take Trollope as a reliable witness to the relative standards of living in his day. But the two items of food of which he gives exact figures are significant. Meat cost 9d. a lb. (they must have insisted on having prime cuts only, as prices were then), and they ate 3 lbs. a day, more than double what such a family would eat today. And they ate 2s. 6d. worth of bread a week per head. I remember the

1s. 4d. 4-lb. loaf in the rationing period of the war just lasting out the week. By our standards the Crawleys had a badly proportioned d etary and enormously over-ate for sedentary people, so far as bread and meat went.

Another nineteenth-century classic will illustrate the changed value of money, if illustration is needed, "A Case of Identity" in *Sherlock Holmes*. Miss Sutherland is the daughter of a tradesman whose business realized £4,700 for good will. She lives with her mother and stepfather, who is in a good position. She herself has the income from a trust fund and earns about £25 a year by typing at home. "Since you draw so large a sum as a hundred a year," says Holmes, "with what you earn into the bargain, you no doubt travel a little and indulge yourself in every way. I believe that a single lady can get on very nicely upon an income of about sixty pounds." Today a London typist of this class would be paid £156 a year, and would think herself hard up.

W. K. L. C.

A NOTE ON Ε'ΤΩΔΊΑ (Phil. iv. 2, 18)

Is not St. Paul intentionally playing on this word as a personal name, and as an idea? He begins the chapter with three names, pleading for peaceful co-operation, remarking that these *names* are recorded in the Book of Life—with others. Their generous attitude to himself resulted in the collection of money or other gifts, now presented by Epaphroditus. The Apostle's delight is not so much in the comfort provided as in the affectionate spirit or "atmosphere" of the donors. He states this in language suitable to the approbation of a deity to whom sacrifice has been made. The welcome fumes assure the god that his worshippers are devoted to him. Ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας may suggest the sweet scent of incense no less than the aroma of the roasted victim. But coming so near to the name Εὐωδία, it looks as though the writer hinted: "I like to think of this offering as redolent of my friend Εὐωδία." In a clumsy modern paraphrase, by substituting a name, and considering the devout floral tributes offered at shrines, one might catch the humour suggested: "Your testimonial is indeed a fragrant Bouquet of Violets, such as Miss Violet Bouquet would give."

G. Holmes-Gore.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL NECESSITY OF ANGELS: A SUGGESTION

The belief in angels is unpopular in certain quarters at the present day. This is due mainly, it would seem, to two reasons. In the first place, angels are so associated in our minds with apocalyptic and traditional eschatology (so much of which we no longer accept literally) that they, too, are regarded simply as part of the "poetry of religion." Secondly, the Christian doctrine of God as a Being at once transcendent *and* immanent, "high and lifted up," yet ever near, seems to make intermediary beings unnecessary, if not superfluous. We tend to connect them with a philosophy which tries to keep God at a respectable distance from the world.

No one has felt these difficulties more than the present writer himself. Yet if we approach the matter from a different angle, there emerges, I think, something of a philosophical necessity for angelic beings. I state the theory boldly at the outset: there must be a part of the universe capable of responding to God's love by a worship that is perfect. Human worship, acceptable to God though it is, obviously is not perfect. Human frailties—" our wandering thoughts and lack of devotion," if nothing else—prevent it from being so. Humanity, furthermore, emerged late on the scene. How was God worshipped before man reached that stage of development at which such a response on his part became possible ? We may say, of course, that there were—and that there still are—beings on other planets capable of worshipping God. But (1) these presumably, like man, underwent an evolutionary process, and were not at the first sufficiently qualified for their great work; (2) their worship even now can hardly be perfect, because of their material nature and surroundings.

The Catholic doctrine of the angels admits of the belief that they were created before the material universe. Is it unreasonable to suggest that, as soon as God began to fashion something out of nothing, a part of that " something " had to be of such a nature that it could worship God " in spirit and in truth " ? Can we think of creation as existing for one moment and not being able, by means of " representatives," to respond *adequately* to God's love ?

If we can establish the belief in angels on such a basis as this, then there is no reason why God, having brought them into being for the purpose suggested, should not also use them as messengers to men and as agents for the carrying out of His will in the physical sphere. In other words, our difficulty over angelology will diminish if we think of the angels as having been created *primarily* to do God " service in heaven," and only in a secondary sense to " succour and defend us on earth."

F. C. Lightbourn.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

The October number of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique* opens with a learned investigation by Father Favre on the clause " Credo . . . in Filium Dei . . . mortuum et sepultum." The opinions of the Fathers examined are Tertullian, Novatian, Gregory of Elvira, St. Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrosiaster, St. Ambrose, Rufinus of Aquileia, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and the conclusion to be drawn from this lengthy investigation is duly set forth. It is detailed, but the details are deserving of careful examination. Father Mollat begins what promises to be a fine set of articles on the right of patronage in Normandy from the eleventh to the fifteenth century. Many will turn with interest to Father Gougaud's inventory of the provenance of mediæval monastic libraries in Great Britain. Not a few of us remember with pride what Montague R. James and the Rev. C. Jenkins have accomplished in this direction. Father D. van den Eynde prints a sepulchral inscription of Novatian. Father Richard writes on the " Testimonia sancti Basili." Father Constant describes the condition of the Church at the beginning of the fifteenth to the sixteenth century according to two contemporary documents.

R. H. M.

REVIEWS

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY. Vol. I.: *The Age of Transition.* Essays by S. H. Hooke, Herbert Loewe, E. O. James, W. O. E. Oesterley. 10s. 6d. Vol. II., *The Contact of Pharisaism with other Cultures.* Essays by H. Loewe, W. L. Knox, J. Parkes, E. Rosenthal, L. Rabinowitz, C. G. Coulton, A. C. Adcock, H. F. Stewart. Sheldon Press. 12s. 6d.

Ten years ago the late Professor F. C. Burkitt wrote a short essay on " The Debt of Christianity to Judaism " (*Legacy of Israel*, pp. 69 *ff.*), and in the course of it he made the point that very much as the early Church took over the Jewish Scriptures of the Old Testament without any Jewish exegetical tradition, so does present-day Christianity try to understand the essentially Jewish story of the Gospels without any—or with singularly little—auxiliary Jewish explanation:

> " Knowledge of Jesus is derived from the Gospels, works written by Christians for Christians, with a minimum of explanation about things that do not directly concern the matters immediately in hand. Christians in general know about the Judaism contemporary with Jesus from the Gospels, and from the Gospels only. In many ways they are good historical sources, almost contemporary, vivid, life-like. But they assume the Jewish background, rather than describe it. What is the result ? In not a few cases that which was once a paradox has become a commonplace. To most Christians ' Pharisee ' is only another name for a hypocrite, ' Sadducee ' for a worldly unbeliever, while ' publicans ' and ' sinners ' are half-expected to say or do something noble or disinterested as soon as they appear on the scene. The famous tale of the Pharisee and the Publican (Luke xviii. 10-14), whether it be regarded as a ' parable ' or a record of something seen, has lost its point today to all but historical students."

Though the present two volumes edited by Dr. Oesterley and Mr. Loewe cannot claim to provide the student of the Gospels with the necessary working knowledge of the background assumed by the Gospels, they at least do much to make plain the nature of the problem of the emergence of Christianity from Jewish origins; and never before has the case for " re-

assessing" the worth of Pharisaism been put forward so persuasively as it is here in the two lengthy essays by Mr. Loewe. It may be said at once that, admirable as are many of the other fifteen essays, it is Mr. Loewe's work which gives the tone and most of the value to these two volumes. (They take up no less than a quarter of the two volumes—not to mention the copious annotations which the learning of Mr. Loewe supplies to the essays of his fellow-contributors.)

In his introductory note to Vol. I., Dr. Lowther Clarke feels it necessary to justify the action of a Christian publishing house in promulgating so forcible a defence and so favourable a picture, by a Jewish scholar, of that feature in first-century Judaism which is most denounced by the Gospels; and he justifies it on the ground that the task of satisfactorily portraying the Jewish background can only be done with Jewish help. This is neither wholly true nor is it at all just to Mr. Loewe. There is now an abundance of material by Jewish and Gentile scholars available for the non-specialist student of the Jewish background-picture; and there are even Gentile workers who have put forward the pro-Pharisee case more strongly and criticized the Gospel accounts more stringently than Mr. Loewe does here. But where Mr. Loewe manifestly surpasses his predecessors (even his revered examplar Dr. Israel Abrahams) is in his capacity and determination to deal sympathetically and comprehendingly with the Christian assumptions. It is not that he has the gift of putting a contrary case in palatable fashion: it is a realization of the futility and mischief of seeing or creating antitheses when the difference may be principally one of perspective or emphasis.

The result is a useful addition to the library of the student of the Gospels and early Judaism, and an eloquent appeal to realize more fully the common ethical content of Christianity and Judaism (which with Mr. Loewe is synonymous with the Pharisaism imperfectly portrayed in the Gospels).

This comparative study of similar or contrasting ideas found in the Gospels and in the Pharisaic or Rabbinic literature is, of course, a centuries-old pastime of the Christian and Jewish controversialist: its value depends very largely on the spirit in which it is conducted. And there can be no complaint of the generous and virtually "Christian" spirit in which Mr. Loewe displays the material. That, however, is not enough. Mr. Loewe does not sufficiently stress the real difficulties.

The core of the Pharisaic literature, namely the Tannaitic collection, is the product of the years subsequent to the Hadrianic persecutions; and so great were the upheavals of the preceding century that to utilize post-Akiban ideas in

illustration of the Judaism of the age of the Procurators is very much as though we were to call upon ideas prevalent in Hanoverian England as evidence in Elizabethan problems. The *halakhic* system which has developed into " normative Judaism " claims a descent from the system of Hillel; but that is far from being an assurance that the ideals of the later second-century Tannaim were equally the ideals of the early decades of the first century. Rabbinic scholarship is not yet sufficiently mature to bridge the gap. The New Testament sources have for long been the object of critical and microscopic scrutiny; but the earlier rabbinic sources have hardly yet been subjected to critical analysis, and only now among Jewish scholars is there dawning a recognition that radical, political and social changes in the first two centuries were not without their effect on the teaching of the Tannaim (*cf.* Bokser, *Pharisaic Judaism in Transition*, New York, 1935).

Four of the nine essays in the first volume are from Dr. Oesterley. He writes briefly on " The General Historical Background," from 323 B.C. to the Destruction of the Temple, on the Hebrew " Wisdom Literature," the pre-Christian teachings about Heaven and Hell, and the belief in angels and demons. Dr. E. O. James gives a handy summary of the features of Græco-Roman religion; and in the course of his three essays Professor Hooke treats of the possible connection of the Mystery religions with Judaism and Christianity, and concludes that they had little effect on Judaism or (though St. Paul was familiar with the terminology of the Mysteries) on Christianity.

The second volume sets out to show the effects of the contact of Judaism (Pharisaism) with other cultures. Mr. Loewe contributes the introductory essay on " The Ideas of Pharisaism." The seven other essays do not always find it easy to point to clear and substantial consequences of contact, whether on the Jews or on their neighbours.

In the course of his discussion of the interplay of Hellenism and Judaism, Canon W. L. Knox offers the interesting hypothesis that the female figure of Wisdom in Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus is to be explained not as a Greek influence but as Jewish home-growth:

> " Wisdom is a personification of the Torah, and . . . is in its origin a deliberate substitution for the great Egyptian goddess Isis, modified in Ecclesiasticus by features taken from Astarte; the two great goddesses, Astarte and Isis, had been identified from time immemorial. The adoption was an attempt to counteract the ever-present danger that Judaism would revert to

its old habit of adding the " Queen of Heaven " to the Pantheon; it substituted for her the semi-personified Torah as an object, not of worship, but of reverence and affection. It is possible that the personification represents an unconscious psychological ' compensation,' but I think it is a deliberate and very successful expedient for safeguarding monotheism."

Dr. Parkes deals with the Jewish contacts on pagan and Christian Rome, and after very detailed scrutiny confesses the most meagre results. Dr. E. Rosenthal, whose subject is " Islam," has more to shew: Jewish influence is not confined to Old Testament and later narrative material in the Koran, but it extends also to the system of prayers and " the striking semblance in the conception of the Divine Laws, in their basic principles, methods and individual legal enactments."

" France in the Thirteenth Century," by Rabbi L. Rabinowitz, whets the appetite: one can bear to hear much more of this period when, it is maintained, the new and simple Biblical exegesis of the Jews of Northern France proved a most enduring influence on Christian thought and paved the way to the Reformation. The lectures by Dr. Coulton and Mr. Adcock on the Feudal period and the century of the Renaissance and Reformation cover relatively familiar ground. The concluding pages by Mr. H. F. Stewart, on the casuistry of the Pharisees and of the Jesuits, only go to shew that human beings at the same stage of mental development think and act alike: in this case borrowing is out of the question: " The medieval churchmen, who declared that to learn Hebrew was to turn Jew, can scarcely have sought help from the Talmud, which they burnt wholesale without reading." H. Danby.

The Philosophical Bases of Theism. By G. Dawes Hicks, Litt.D. Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.

These Hibbert Lectures of 1931 are a philosophical apologetic in the same field in which Father Martindale, in the book reviewed above, is apologizing popularly. Professor Dawes Hicks takes his stand upon the traditional arguments. He states and defends them with a caution which is no doubt commendable in intention, but in effect it leaves the impression that he is, in the vulgar sense, apologizing, especially when contrasted with the firm and uncompromising logic of the introductory chapters on the nature of " experience " and " knowledge," and the proper function of philosophy.

The argument from religious experience is taken first.

Professor Dawes Hicks is at pains to refute the notion of "feeling" as a spiritual entity divorced from all cognition. The feeling may be, in thought, abstracted from the awareness, but in fact there can be nothing which can be described as a "feeling," apart from an awareness of that feeling in the sentient subject. The only legitimate way in which "religious experience" can be a datum for theistic speculation is therefore this: I am aware of having a "feeling" of a certain kind, and this fact leads me to deduce (with whatever degree of certainty) the existence of God, as being the most, or the only, feasible origin of this "feeling." The argument is deduction, and on all fours with the cosmological or other similar proofs. Professor Dawes Hicks rightly discountenances the idea that a man can have immediate "experience" of God as he has immediate experience of pain. Suppose he could. Such a God would be an entity of a kind analogous to a pain; he would exist only as the "feeling" of a sentient being. Nor do we have immediate *knowledge* of God as we do of ourselves (p. 145). But these facts do not affect the validity of the logical deduction from the fact of religious experience, immediately recognized, to the existence of God as the explanation of that experience. Whether the "religious experience" is ever of a kind which can render this conclusion more than highly probable must be left to the experiencer to decide. This seems to be in substance what Professor Dawes Hicks is asserting, but occasional phrases make his position seem uncertain. For instance, he says (p. 134), "subjective certitude and objective certainty are not the same things." To be certain of anything can only properly mean to know it. And within knowledge the distinction of subjective and objective will not hold. If I know something (subjectively, if you will), it can only be because it is objectively true. No doubt we often fail to analyze our mental states. I may say I am certain, and act as if I were certain, when I have only a conviction based on high probability. But in that case, in spite of my words or my action, I am *not* certain—*i.e.*, I do not know. What is true is that because of this habit of insufficient attention a man may *say*, "I am certain," when he is in fact not certain. Therefore the fact of someone else's religious experience can never be *a proof* to me in the same way as it is to him. Because my datum is not that *he has had* a certain experience (that can only be his datum), but that *he says* he has had it, and, however much I respect his veracity, this datum can never be *to me* beyond the possibility of error. This, perhaps, is what Professor Dawes Hicks means, but the distinction of "subjective certitude" and "objective certainty" is not happy.

The cosmological argument he states in the form that " the existence of nature being contingent existence, is dependent upon a mode of being that is not contingent but necessary." But he will not allow the argument to a First Cause, on the grounds (*a*) that he cannot " intelligibly conceive of a Deity quiescent for ages, and then, once upon a time, being suddenly stimulated to call a universe into being." (But why " for ages "? No defender of the argument wants to suppose that God existed in time " before " He made time.) And (*b*) his main contention—that causality is not to be attributed to wills at all, but the notions of " energy," " force," and " cause," are applicable only to material things. So he denies that God is Creator in the sense in which Creation means something causally dependent. Admittedly, in calling Professor Dawes Hicks the " cause " of the existence of his book, and in calling the failing light the cause of my eyestrain, there is a difference in the usage of " cause." But I do understand myself as causing, originating, even (I sometimes say) creating, things; and (whether or no the word " cause " in this usage should be avoided) the fact simply is that the existence of the universe which, as a whole, neither I nor any man originated, does postulate an originator. The question whether we should deny " energy " to the will is neither profitable in itself nor germane to the argument.

The teleological argument Professor Dawes Hicks puts forward as valid but not " absolutely irrefragable " (p. 197), since it is based not on *a priori* truth but on " matters of fact " (p. 192), about which, he says, there can be no certainty. And this is in distinction from the cosmological proof, which, apparently, Professor Dawes Hicks thinks " absolutely irrefragable " so far as it goes. The distinction is an odd one. The datum in both proofs is the physical universe, and a certain property of that universe (viz., in the one, its contingency; in the other, its purposiveness). In both the argument is deductive, to the existence of some being logically necessitated by these " matters of fact." The whole principle of this epistemological dichotomy is inexact and misleading. A " matter of fact " (ironic title !) is, we are told, something of which the contrary is still possible (p. 190). An example given is that the sun will rise tomorrow. It is alleged that it is intelligible to say it will not. It is, because (as far as we know) there may be an element of contingency about this future possible event. Tomorrow's sunrise is not (for all we know) a fact at all. But I do know that the sun is shining now, and the contrary of that fact is not possible because a thing cannot both be and not be at the same time. The bulk of the chapter,

relating the recent theories of physicists and biologists to the argument, has a far surer touch, and, however diffident of his other legs, here is one on which Professor Dawes Hicks is prepared to trust his weight.

The moral argument is introduced by a distinction between the "existence" of entities in time and the "subsistence" of "values" with which certain philosophers would quarrel. But however this may be, it does not seem to affect Professor Dawes Hicks's ultimate conclusion as to the categorical, objective nature of the moral imperative, the evidence that this fact affords for the belief in an objective Ideal or supreme value.

The last chapter sets out the ontological proof with great fairness and clarity, and the flaws in the supposed reputations of both Gaunilo and Kant are given due attention. Professor Dawes Hicks contends that to understand the argument aright it is necessary to conceive of the absolute, not, with Spinoza, as Substance, but rather, with Hegel, as Subject. He is also careful to criticize the notion that finite minds are *parts* of the universal Mind, or finite wills *parts* of the Universal Will, and insists that "if we are to think of God as a self-conscious being, the element of otherness must remain; the experiences of finite selves cannot form part of the Divine experience, in the same sense, or in any other sense, in which they are the experiences of the selves in question." He concludes that "religion rests upon belief in a supreme living and personal mind."

R. C. Ratcliff.

NOTICES

Sprücke Salomos. By B. Gemser. J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen. M. 3.80.

This commentary on *Proverbs* is the latest volume of the " Handbuch Zum Alten Testament " Series, edited by Otto Eissfeldt. The translation, which is admirable, is presented in the metrical form corresponding with that of the Hebrew; each section is followed by text-critical and grammatical notes, after which comes the commentary. It is a real pleasure to read Professor Gemser's rendering, which we find superior to any that we have yet come across; it is frequently in itself an explanatory comment on the Hebrew. The text-critical notes are always to the point, and there are no fantastic textual emendations. The notes are full, not yet overloaded, and always interesting. The work is to be highly recommended. The only criticism which we have to make concerns the Introduction. It may well be due to necessary restrictions as to space, but one receives the impression that the author has not had an entirely free hand. For example, the third section deals with the dates of the various collections embodied in *Proverbs*; then, in the following section, headed, " The first collection i.-ix.," we have a short account of the contents and characteristics of this collection, ending with a reference to its date. But this is the only one of the nine collections dealt with in this way; one naturally expects that the others will be similarly dealt with, so that the impression is forced on the reader that part of the Introduction has been omitted. This is to be regretted, for everything that the author says strikes us as excellent.

The commentary itself contains an immense amount of illuminating and useful matter with which it is, of course, impossible to deal in a short review. One interesting little point may, however, be mentioned. Professor Gemser draws attention to the frequent assonances in the earliest collections (x.-xxii. 6 and xxv.-xxix.), pointing out that these are mnemotechnical helps constructed by the Sages for their pupils. The later Rabbis, whose sayings are preserved in the Talmud, often stressed the need of this in teaching the young, shewing themselves therein as the successors of the Sages. W. O. E. Oesterley.

Value and Ethical Objectivity. By Gordon S. Jury. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

A thorough examination of the nature and basis of ethics. The author's contention is that value is an ultimate, that ethical terms cannot be defined with reference to any other order, and hence that ethics is a science in its own right with its own laws and methods and is not to be considered as a branch of physics, psychology, or any other study. Useful in dealing with subjectivists. E. L. Mascall.

Frontiers of Faith and Reason. By Vincent McNabb, O.P. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

Fr. McNabb has here collected into a single volume thirty papers of varying length written and published by him over half a lifetime. They cover a broad range, and have (as he acknowledges) no unity in themselves,

save that of springing from a single acute, ingenious and naturally curious mind. The earlier are concerned with the more metaphysical problems suggested by the general title. St. Thomas is his master, and among them is an ordered statement on St. Thomas's teachings on Biblical inspiration. To these, Fr. McNabb adds a brief elucidation, designed to shew the considerable range which such principles would admit to Roman Catholic Biblical scholars.

Fr. McNabb's own Biblical interests are represented in the later essays. They are all suggestive and testify to a careful scrutiny of the text. Reference can only be made to a few of the points he raises. Some have particular interest as revealing the effect on exegesis of belief in the Petrine claims. Thus 1 Peter is interpreted as the encyclical of the General Pastor of the Church, after the decision of the Council of Jerusalem (at which "the difficulty had been finally settled by his authority"), to those Galatian Christians to whom at an earlier date St. Paul had written. (The relations of the two Apostles are everywhere accepted as friendly.) The last twelve verses of St. Mark came to be lost through deliberate omission in public reading, lest the weight of St.Paul's statement that "the first official appearance of the Risen Christ" was to Cephas (1 Cor. xv. 5) should be confused by St. Peter's own "humble admission" (St. Mark xvi. 9) that "the Lord appeared first to Mary Magdalen." Elsewhere, the author draws attention, in a paper entitled "Communion in one kind," to the careful distinction in 1 Cor. xi. 26-27 (followed accurately by the Rheims version and recently by the Revised Version, but *not by the Authorized*) between the phrases referring to the sacrificial side of the Mass ("eat *and* drink," verse 26) and those referring to Communion ("eat *or* drink," verse 27). He suggests that the origin of the Epiclesis is to be found in a divine authentication by the Holy Spirit of the Church's First Mass on the day of Pentecost, parallel to that at the call and baptism of the first Gentile (Acts x. 44-47). In some pages on the Ritual of Marriage, he regrets (with Cardinal Schuster) the loss in the Roman rite of some of the early ceremonies retained in the East, and *by Sarum*; and records the publication by the exiled English clergy at Douai in 1604 of a book for the lesser offices (including Marriage) *iuxta usu insignis ecclesiæ Sarisburiensis*. A footnote, on which we forbear to comment, adds: "When Cardinal Vaughan was beginning the great work of building Westminster Cathedral the Roman Authorities suggested that he should restore the Sarum Rite"! We have pulled some plums out of the cake to whet the appetite of others—and there are plenty that remain.

HENRY DE CANDOLE.

A FRESH APPROACH TO THE PSALMS. By W. O. E. Oesterley. Ivor Nicholson and Watson. 8s. 6d. Pp. 303.

This new volume in the *International Library of Christian Knowledge* has come at an opportune moment, perhaps more opportune than some of us realize. About the Psalms, as about everything else, criticism is in the air, and the whole question of their use in public worship is being raised. The modern worshipper requires more relief than a new system of pointing, or the substitution of plainsong for Anglican chants! With a book like this at our command, we have no longer an excuse for neglecting the *study* of the Psalms.

Many of us older folk will approach the task with mixed feelings. The

Psalter has been so long an intimate companion of the soul, that we shrink from the thought of strapping it to the dissecting table of scholarship. The Psalms to us are just hymns, prayer-poems, sweet-sounding syllables with a meaning more deep than words. We have our own way of spiritualizing certain incongruities.

But the subjective approach today is not enough, and here is a book full of facts we ought to know. Not that it is in any sense a " defence " of the Psalms. But it does give, in a compendious and authoritative form, a mine of solid information for those who would sing with the spirit, and sing with the understanding also. It shews, above all, that there need be no antithesis between the most searching scholarship and a profoundly spiritual approach to this ancient Treasury of Devotion. Quite obviously, Dr. Oesterley loves the Psalms none the less for understanding them the more. " Their appeal to the hearts of men nothing," he says, " can ever lessen, where the religious instinct is not suppressed: for they are on the one hand a constant reminder of God's love for man, and on the other, a never ceasing incentive to man to be true to God."

Here we shall find almost all that modern scholarship has been able to discover about this somewhat elusive subject. There are four tightly packed chapters about the Psalms as literature—their parallels in other tongues, their authorship and date, their titles, and so on. A mass of curious lore is embodied in three chapters on the music and metre of Hebrew poetry. Most interesting of all to the readers of THEOLOGY, perhaps, will be the next three dealing with the liturgical use of the Psalms in Jewish and Christian worship. There was a time, it seems, when every clergyman was expected to know the whole of the Psalter off by heart, and there never was a time when it was not an integral part of Christian worship.

Very valuable to the student of doctrinal development are the last five chapters on the Theology of the Psalms, especially in relation to Messianic interpretation, belief in God, teaching about sin, and their expectation of immortality. Nothing could be more methodical or more lucid than the treatment these difficult questions here receive.

This is not the sort of book to read straight through and send back to the library: it is rather a book of reference which one ought to have always at hand. All the more pity that alas ! there is no subject index, an omission which even the publisher's beautiful type and general format can scarce excuse. For myself, too (though I know it is a most unscholarly not to say sectarian prejudice), I do wish these learned men who write about the Psalms would quote from the Prayer Book or at least the Bible, instead of setting one's teeth on edge with brand new copyright translations of their own. *Cf.* CXV. 17, " The dead praise not thee, Yah !"

STEPHEN L. CAIGER.

THE THEORY OF ÆSTHETICS

THE PROBLEM OF ART. By Peter Green. Longmans. 6s.

It may seem at first sight rather strange that Canon Peter Green, who has a definite and growing public for his theology, should suddenly give us a book on art; but if such an event needed an apology it would be atoned for by the contents of this book. Canon Green says, " I was interested in Æsthetics long before I knew anything of Ethics "; but in

so busy a life as his it has been impossible to keep abreast of those movements in art which, together with others, give an author the right to frame a complete theory of æsthetics. The value of his book therefore lies less in the theory which it propounds (so far as it can be said to propound one) than in its plea for a reconstruction of our educational and social systems in such a manner as to include a more positive place for æsthetics.

Now it is gradually dawning upon the world that the core of our modern trouble is in our educational system; and that only by a more or less drastic reorganization of it can health and peace be restored to our unhappy world. Nobody who thinks this is likely to doubt that art must receive much more attention than hitherto, as the training of the emotions is as important as the training of the intellect or the will. Canon Green divides Man's activities into these three categories, and, while he is far too sound a moral theologian to suppose that they can be split up into completely different compartments of personality, he has no difficulty in shewing their quite separate functions; and that all artistic pursuits are the sublimation of emotional impulses. Of these three divisions of personality, the emotional is the most subjective and consequently the most difficult to deal with in any finality. As Canon Peter Green says:

" If two men discuss fruit, and one says, ' Those five oranges in that dish weigh more than the pine-apple,' and the other says, ' No, the pine-apple weighs more than the five oranges put together,' one of them must be wrong. But if one says, ' The flavour of an orange is better than that of a pine-apple,' while the other says, ' No, the flavour of a pine-apple is better than that of an orange,' no question of one being right and the other wrong arises. They are expressing personal likes and dislikes. If the subject were worth while, it would be possible to collect the opinions of millions of people who know the taste of both fruits. *We should be no nearer settling the point.*"

That is perfectly true, and it shews very forcibly the great difficulties of formulating a philosophy of art; but Canon Green is on highly debatable ground when he says: " Nor should we have any right to say one side is right and the other wrong " when a ballot had been taken of all the races and classes of society in the world ! For, if all the more developed races thought one way and all the undeveloped another, or all educated people one way and all uneducated another, we could only come to one conclusion on the matter by declaring that racial development and culture had nothing whatever to do with taste; and that would prove the bankruptcy of Canon Green's whole book. For all artistic taste is " physical " in so far as it is mediated through one or other of the senses.

It may be said, however, that Canon Peter Green's book is an admirable guide to the intellectual and moral value of æsthetics; and, on the practical side, to the possibilities for the use of art in education, commerce and international affairs. This is a side of the whole problem of art that needs developing; and it may yet come about that æsthetics will prove a greater factor in the preservation of peace than either armaments or politics. It is in such a hope as this that the author who is primarily a theologian would seem to have undertaken this book; and we may well hope that others, more accustomed to specialize in the subject, will not be slow to take up the theme.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD. By St. Thomas Aquinas. Translated by Laurence Shapcote, O.P.

THE THREE GREATEST PRAYERS. By St. Thomas Aquinas. Translated by Laurence Shapcote, O.P.

THE FRANCISCAN VISION. By St. Bonaventure. Translated by Father James, O.M.Cap. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 2s. 6d. each.

Those who only know St. Thomas as the author of the *Summa Theologica* may be surprised to find that the logical and philosophical writer can also write simply and devotionally. The reason for such is that, as Maritain says, the impress of Benedictine spirituality remained indelibly engraved upon his heart, and that, as Chesterton said, like every wise man, he was a philosopher in public and a mystic in private life. Even on such familiar themes as the Decalogue, Lord's Prayer, Angelus and Apostles' Creed, the Angelic Doctor has something new to say in a fresh way and from an original angle. " To say " is correct, because these two books are reports of addresses, *collationes* not *sermones*, given at Naples in Lent, 1273—that is, about a year before St. Thomas' death. One cannot fail to appreciate their strict use of Holy Scripture—the " Bread of God's word," as St. Thomas calls it. One can fully recommend these books for meditation. The translation is very readable though in a few places somewhat free, but that is for the non-Latinist's benefit.

Dominican spirituality is intellectual but Franciscan affective. The *Itinerarium Mentis in Deum*, here called *The Franciscan Vision*, is a prose poem dealing with the soul's pursuit of perfection. Believing that contemplation is open to all, St. Bonaventure acts as guide to the pilgrim's progress in holiness, and has many wise aids to offer which, if heeded, will enrich the serious reader's spiritual life. There is much thought in this little essay, so much in fact that some maintain that the work is philosophical rather than mystical, and a first reading may suggest that it is closer related to the Benedictine or Dominican schools of spirituality than to the Franciscan. Certainly here is lacking the usual Franciscan reference to the love of the Cross, to holy Poverty and to the Child Jesus. The character of the book is dependent on the familiar mediæval theme of a universe in which all creation bears the traces of the Creator; it is almost a spiritual commentary on the text " For from the greatness and beauty of created things, their Creator may be seen and known " (Wisd. xiii. 5). Such an explanation of the material order as being sacramental, an outward and visible sign symbolizing the Trinity of the Christian God, may not be very apparent to the modern religious reader, but nevertheless the inner message of the book will not be lost provided that the reader does not forget to read, as St. Bonaventure advises him, with devotion as well as speculation, with charity as well as knowledge.

One should be advised to study these classical works on spirituality rather than modern works, because the best modern works are based on, and influenced by, the great masters of devotion, and those that are not, are not worth reading. There is a finality about devotion; it cannot age or become out of date even though its vocabulary may be somewhat obsolete. Probably the *Imitatio Christi* is more popular today than ever, and not only or chiefly because more people are able to read, but because its message is for all time, the same yesterday, today and forever.

PATRICK COWLEY.

DOES GOD MATTER FOR ME? By C. C. Martindale, S.J. Rich and Cowan. 3s. 6d.

For every one in England who is an agnostic or an atheist by intellectual conviction, there are perhaps hundreds who do not believe in God "practically." As a speculative proposition the existence of God does not interest them. They do not wish to deny it, but they live (to a great extent) as though He were not. To these "practical" agnostics Fr. Martindale addresses this convincing and charitable book. It is, as he professes, "popular," in that it is brought within a realm of ideas with which ordinary people are not unfamiliar, and the language presupposes no technical theological knowledge.

In the first chapter Fr. Martindale makes a rapid but searching analysis of certain popular attitudes of mind to the existence of God, and of various habits of character which involve or imply an attitude to that fact. In the second chapter, with a few shrewd but kindly hits, he makes short work of the popular notions of what is theologically implied by the writings of Marx, Freud, Darwin, and Sir J. G. Frazer. In the third he presents the traditional arguments for our belief in the existence of God, though he wisely refrains both from calling them arguments and from labelling them traditional. There is great skill here in the way in which Fr. Martindale has found language which cogently presents the arguments, without that technical dress which (for purely psychological reasons) makes them vaguely suspect to the lay mind.

Chapters IV.-VII. deal with the attributes of God discoverable by unaided reason—His Holiness, His Unity, His Omnipotence, and His Omniscience, His Moral Lordship. (The chapter headings, like the title of the book, are mostly unilluminating, and the only poor thing there.) Finally, there are two chapters on "God and Human Society" and "God and Prayer." Much here, also, is shrewdly said and to the point, but the latter part of the book lacks that touch of almost inevitable rightness which marks every paragraph of the first three chapters.

The preacher could find here most useful suggestions for the manner of presentation of a subject much neglected in our pulpits today. Also it is a book which it is not hard to imagine any reasonably intelligent agnostic reading from cover to cover, though with what result, in these days when sound logic is at a discount, it is hard to say.

The Scriptures are quoted fairly often through the course of the book. Not that Fr. Martindale is guilty of such a *petitio principii* as to appeal to proof texts to demonstrate the existence of the alleged Revealer. He quotes the words of Scripture as being the best he knows to express the point he is making. But he quotes in a version which is, apparently, his own, trying (he says) "to provide the maximum of meaning with the minimum of alteration of familiar renderings." This minimum turns out to be fairly extensive, and the effect of this practice is to give the impression of a series of digressions into a critical exposition of Holy Writ. The diction of the translations (especially of the Psalms) is fine enough, and the expositions implied often illuminating to anyone interested in the Bible. But there lingers the suggestion of a second bird in the offing at which Fr. Martindale can hardly resist having a shy with the stone whose proper target it is not. R. C. RATCLIFF.

MEDITATIO MEDICI. By W. Cecil Bosanquet. Gale and Polden. 7s. 6d.

This book, which bears the sub-title "A Doctor's Philosophy of Life," consists of four sections. The first gives an admirably lucid account of "Ancient and Modern Views of the Material Universe." The second deals with the "Development of Man." The greater part of this is excellent, but some passages are questionable, to say the least. How many anthropologists would agree, for instance, that in primitive life the individual is scarcely regarded as responsible in any way to the clan (p. 59)? Again, Dr. Bosanquet recognizes the immensely important part played by Christianity in the building-up of the civilization of the white races, and he feels that there is need of some "spiritual enthusiasm to inspire unity and co-operation" if that civilization is to survive; but he thinks that this can be supplied by the "Christian system of ethics." He asserts in a most unphilosophical way that "the essence of the Christian religion would seem to be unselfishness, sympathy, mutual affection, and assistance," and that the rest is due to the influence of Asiatic mysticism, mediæval superstition, and the follies of wrangling sects (p. 68). Whether or not one accepts this estimate of Christianity, a knowledge of human nature and of religious history does not encourage the belief that a moral code, however excellent in itself, can have the effective influence which is seen to be needed. The third section is entitled "The Physical Aspect of Consciousness or Mind." Dr. Bosanquet holds that "we only know mind as a property or function of a living organism" (the body), and his thesis is that it is no more. A great defect of his reasoning seems to be that, while he writes at length of the dependence of the mind on the body, and of the influence of the latter upon mental states and processes, he says hardly anything of the other side of the picture, the influence of the mind on the body. It would be interesting to hear a debate between Dr. Bosanquet and Dr. H. P. Newsholme, who in his books *Health, Disease, and Integration*, and *Evolution and Redemption*, approaches the subject from the other point of view and reaches very different conclusions. Nor is Dr. Bosanquet always logical. On p. 95, for instance, we find that "it seems probable" that a particular thing is true in the one example which he gives, is followed by "we *must* conclude, then, that . . . is *always* . . ." The last section deals with "The Principles of Voluntary Action and Conduct," and the line followed is that which one would expect after what has gone before. It is held that good conduct is that which is beneficial to oneself or the community or the race, and that conscience is an instinctive following of that which is advantageous in this way. But he realizes the difficulty, from his point of view, of answering the question, "Why ought mankind to observe the dictates of the moral law?" and he prefers "the simpler question, 'Why they actually do so?'" But surely the whole problem is that they do *not* do so, and yet feel that they should.

There is much to criticize in this book, but it is of great interest as an attempt to work out a philosophy of life on a purely materialistic basis. It certainly deserves careful study by those called upon to present the Christian faith to the modern scientific mind.

G. W. BROOMFIELD.

MAN AND ETERNITY. The Cambridge Summer School Lectures for 1936. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 7s. 6d.

This volume of papers, read to the Summer School of Catholic Studies, is quite worthy of place in a distinguished series of volumes. The general subject is that of eschatology, and the Biblical essays are exceptionally good. It is difficult to see, however, why Fr. Lattey must launch into an attack upon Marxism. As Dr. Needham has pointed out, Marxism is but a secularized form of the spirit which ran through Amos, Hosea, and Jesus Himself. It is certainly eschatological, and comparisons might be made in a positive manner from which useful conclusions could be drawn. The essay upon the resurrection of the body is strictly orthodox and fails to notice the more liberal tradition with regard to that doctrine, associated with such names as Origen, F. D. Maurice, and Bp. Westcott, an interpretation which is of modern interest owing to the charge of heresy which it provoked against Dr. Major. The paper on the subject of Hell is profoundly unsatisfying, especially to any reader who has been at all influenced by the theology of "the larger hope," or even by so old-fashioned a writer as Dean Farrar. The whole volume left upon our mind an impression of thankfulness for the broader limits of Anglican theology, whilst at the same time it appealed to us as a competent piece of work of the greatest use to any reader who is desirous of learning what is the Roman Catholic attitude upon the problems of eschatology, a subject of increasing importance with the collapse of a non-eschatological theological liberalism.

F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT.

RELIGION AND THE STATE. By H. Maurice Relton, D.D. The Unicorn Press. 3s. 6d.

There is little that is new or original in these published lectures, but the material is attractively handled and arranged, and the list of authorities quoted impressive. Dr. Relton covers familiar ground in discussing the "religious" significance of the New Paganism, Humanism, and the Totalitarian State in its various forms, and the most interesting parts of the book are those which deal with historical changes in the relationship between Church and State. There are three possible relationships, one or other of which has received predominant emphasis at certain times and in certain periods of human history. (1) Church and State wholly separated, as in the period from the commencement of the Christian era to the peace of Constantine. (2) Church and State practically identical as in the Mediæval Church-State. (3) Church and State in some form of alliance, or a concordat between them, as in modern days. In a concluding chapter, added to the lectures, Dr. Relton discusses Church and State in England with special reference to "our present difficulties." This is a very useful addition.

MARGUERITE HOWSE.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher